Bx. 14.18

THE ANSWER TO THE Report, &c.

Which the

United Miniſters

Appointed their Committee to draw up, as in the Preface.

ALSO

LETTERS of the Right Reverend the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and the Reverend Dr. *Edwards*, to Mr. *Williams*; againſt whom their Teſtimony was produced by Mr. *Lob*.

And Animadverſions on Mr. *LOB*'s Defence of *The Report*.

By Daniel Williams.

London, Printed by *Sam. Darker*, for *John Lawrence* at the *Angel* in the *Poultrey*. 1698.

The Preface.

I Shall give a true Narrative of the Compoſing and Publiſhing of the following Sheets. The *United Miniſters*, after their uſual receſs, met at St. *Hellens*, *Sept.* 6. 1697. After previous Debates [it was Unanimouſly voted that the *Committee* ſhould take notice of the Papers called, *The Report* and the *Remarks*. And if any Brother had any thing to offer about the ſame, that he ſhould communicate it to them, in order to their drawing up an *Anſwer*.] The Committee conſiſts of Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *How*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Woodhouſe*, Mr. *Spademan*, Mr. *Nath. Taylor*.

Sept. 20. 1697. [The Anſwer of the Committee to the *Report*, &c. was read, and ordered to be read a ſecond time next *Monday*.] Note, 1. They of the Committee, who applied themſelves to this Work, were Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr, *Woodhouſe*, Mr. *Spademan*, and Mr. *Nath. Taylor*. Six of them ſeverally peruſed this Anſwer to the *Report*; and after ſeveral Meetings, all the Seven Unanimouſly agreed thereto, and brought it to the Meeting as the Anſwer they had prepared. The moſt material parts were read to Dr. *Bates* (particularly the Propoſal, p. 27, 28. The Accouut of the Subſcription to the firſt Paper, and concerning my Book, p. 41, 42, &c.) and approved of by him. Our Rule is, that no matter of moment ſhall be determined, unleſs it have been openly and freely debated, and agreed in one Meeting, and then re-aſſumed and concluded in a Second Meeting. 3. This Anſwer was debated, and agreed to in the Meeting; tho a Brother had objected againſt its being in the Name of the Body. *Sep.* 27. 1697. [Reſolved that the Reading of the Anſwer to the Report, be deferred to this day Fortnight, that the Committee may have time to conſider.] *Note*, 1. The occaſion of this delay, was not any thing objected againſt any part of this Anſwer; But three of the Brethren inſiſted that it was too

great a Condescention in the Body, to Answer so insignificant a Person as the Author of the Report; And that this Present *Answer* should be Published by a particular Brother, and that some inconveniency might attend putting forth any Answer in the Name of the Body. 2. The thing to be considered by the *Committee* was, what expedient could be offered, or Reason given, why this Answer should not be Published in the Name of the United Ministers as such. 3. The *Committee met*, and debated. But one of the foresaid three Brethren remained unsatisfied, that any Answer should be Printed in the Name of the Body of the United Ministers. The debate was put off to another time.

October 11. 1697. [Mr. *Hammond* acquainted the Brethren that the Committee was not ready to give in their Report.] Upon some of the Brethren begining to express their resentments at these delays; I spake to this effect: [Mr. *Moderator*, Tho I have met with no Reason that's cogent with me, or with many of the Brethren, why any be unwilling the Answer should be Published in the Name of the Body of the United Ministers, yet the dissatisfaction of any worthy Brother, *&c.* Is so inconvenient at this juncture, that I shall not insist on the present reading of our Answer here.—But I shall acquaint you, that some or other of the Brethren will cause this Answer to be Printed, with an Account how far it hath proceeded among us.] This proved a satisfying expedient, of which no Man expressed any dislike. Hereupon a Vote which past *nemine contradicente*, Sep. 27. 1697. (When all were present, who desired further time to consider whether the Answer should be in the Name of all the United Ministers) was now repeated and unanimously approved; the Vote was, [We Judge it needful that there be an Answer to two Papers, called the *Report* and the *Remarks*, in Vindication of the United Ministers from the Charge therein made against them.] Thus

far

far and no further did this Anſwer to the Report, proceed in our Meeting of Miniſters; nor did I keep it a ſecret when in the Preſs. But moſt of the Brethren were informed thereof, whereat none expreſſed (that I know of) any diſſatisfaction. As for the *Epiſtle* and *the Reflections on the Remarks*, they went no further than the Committee, and were not to be brought to the Meeting till after the Anſwer had paſt.

Tho this Narrative informs you, that this Anſwer is not Publiſhed in the Name of the Body of the United Miniſters, becauſe the Confirmation of it by a ſecond Reading is *ſuſpended*, and only ſo. Yet the Original Papers and the Matters of Fact declared, are as unqueſtionable, and the Doctrines herein acknowledged are as much their common ſentiments, as if the Anſwer had been Publiſhed in the Name of the Body. For I appeal to the Book of *St. Hellens*, for the Truth of this Narrative, and to the Copy peruſed and marked by the Committee, that there is no Change in the *Anſwer* to the Report, except one amendment in the date of time. Nor in the *Epiſtle, or Reflections on the Remarks*, beſides one expreſſion ſoftned by the Committees direction.

Could the Anſwer of a particular Brother, as well expreſs the Doctrines aſſented to by the United Miniſters, and obtain the ſame Credit in a recital of Matters of Fact (in both which lies their Vindication) as this Anſwer [which their Committee was appointed to draw, and which they brought in to the Meeting as their prepared Anſwer, and which was once agreed to by the Body, and unexcepted againſt in any one Paſſage, when it was ſuſpended to gratify three of the Brethren,] I ſhould have preferred the Liberty of Anſwering alone, if I had not Judged it needleſs after ſo great an Anſwer as *the Faithful Rebuke*, which was ſo acceptable that only the modeſty of the Author prevented the thanks of the United Miniſters, for his putting

ting a ſtop to the evil effects of the Report, whilſt their Meetings were diſcontinued.

I have ſubjoyned that *Second Paper*, mentioned in the *Report*, &c. As alſo one of the Letters of the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and one of the Reverend Dr. *Edwards*, both whoſe Books Mr. *Lob* cites againſt me: and therefore I thought none fitter to vindicate me againſt his Charge, and their own Books from the ill uſe he wreſted them to ſerve. Laſtly, Mr. *Lob*'s *Defence* of the *Report*, with a Challenge to me coming forth, when theſe were in the Preſs; Friendſhip and Juſtice to the *Rebuker* prompted my beſtowing a few hours to ſtop the ill effects of this *grand peice of Art and Miſrepreſentation*, (it's nothing elſe) until he ſhall better ſift, and more expoſe it. And one thing I hint, which I thought proper for him to overlook. If after all this Evidence Mr. *Lob* can find a people ſo credulous and bewitched by prejudice, as to ſay, The United Miniſters, or my ſelf, are *Socinians*; that the difference on our part (tho it's ſo on theirs) have been about meer Words or Trifles; that we have oppoſed any thing but Groſs *Criſpianiſm*, that we brake the Union, or refuſed Re-union from a Zeal for Errors againſt the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, or Juſtification by his Righteouſneſs; They deſerve Pity rather than Argument. That at laſt Truth and Peace may prevail, is the Prayer of,

Nov. 17. 1697. *Daniel Williams.*

To the Reader.

NOne are more afflicted than our ſelves under thoſe unſeaſonable diſſentions, which we would have Concealed, when our utmoſt Endeavours and Compliances could neither prevent, nor yet put a Period to. But the Authors of the Printed Papers which we confute, have contrived ſo to Proclaim our differences, by ſending thoſe ſheets in Letters to moſt of our Miniſters in the Kingdom, yea, to forreign parts, and to Multitudes of Private Perſons: That our

De-

Defence, instead of making our Divisions more known, will scarce reach those already mis-informed. Had the Charge contained only small mistakes, or lesser Errors; Christian Prudence might forbid an Answer. But when they publish us guilty of such destructive Opinions, as they say subvert the Doctrine of Christs satisfaction, yea, and make it impossible; and this not as rash Censurers, but pretending to cite our own Paper for their Charge; A Vindication is necessary, unless we ought to Prostitute our Ministry, betray the Truth, lye under the brand of Heretical Opinions, induce others by our Example to entertain such Errors, and Confirm those who are already infected. Had the Accusation been still confined to some particular Brethren, our Practice hitherto may convince the World, we had not as a body *set forth this Vindication: But when the Authors of the Report,* &c. *Accuse all who sent the Third Paper,* i. e. *the Body of the* United Brethren in and about London: *Nothing short of our own Publick Testimony can be sufficient to declare what our Principles be, or acquit us from holding those horrid Errors, they so confidently as well as falsely ascribe unto us. A particular Brothers Defence of us would be incompetent to these Ends, had any one been willing thereby to expose himself.*

And yet tho the Reporters write for, and pretend to give the Sense of all the Dissenting Brethren, as well as to Arraign and Condemn all us the United Ministers: Nevertheless, we direct our Confutation only to the Authors of the Report, *and of that called* Remarks, *with such as consented to and approved thereof. We are so far from intending any other Persons, that we hope, none besides them will esteem themselves reflected on in this our Defence: Nor had we given any Narrative of the rise and progress of our differences (least more might appear intended;) But that the Report and Remarks do so frequently declare, that our Divisions hitherto have been caused only by our contending for Socinian Errors against Christs satisfaction. We also desire the Reader to observe that what we call the* First Paper, *Is that which several Congregational Brethren con-*

tend

tend for. That which we call the Third Paper, *is, that which the United Brethren sent as a mean of Re-Union to those who have left the Union. And when we Term such as left the Union, and approve of the Report,* Dissenters, *it is not from any dis-respect, but because the Report chuseth to call them by the Name of* Dissenting Brethren, p. 4. *And whereas once or twice we have occasion to give a Narrative only of some things declared by some of our Brethren, we do not therein determine concerning such things, further than to report that those Brethren have declared such things as we there mention.*

With this necessitated Vindication of our selves and Ministry, we think it incumbent on us to warn all Persons, especially such of you as stand more peculiarly related to us; that you be not shaken in mind, *but that you remain stedfast in the Faith in this time, when seducers not only abound, but under various disguises are so unusually active, and successful to the Reproach of Christianity, and the apparent danger of the Souls seduced by them. Lament with us to see all revealed Religion exposed by some, the Godhead and Satisfaction of Christ our Blessed Redeemer denied by others, and Doctrines which have a direct tendency to libertinism espoused by too many. All which, with the residue of the great Errors at this time Propagated; do (however inconsistent they seem) jointly contribute to the subverting of the true Religion, and threaten misery to these Kingdoms.*

And as we would excite your Godly Zeal for the Truths and Laws of Christ, against Opinions, subverting the Foundations of Faith, and militating against Practical Godliness: So with equal concern we must exhort you, to have fervent Charity towards all Christians, and to walk in Peace with all who call upon the Name of the Lord out of a pure Heart. Notwithstanding differences in lesser matters. Whereunto we have attained, let us all walk by the same Rule; waiting with mutual forbearance, till God shall reveal those things to such, Who at present are otherwise minded than our selves.

Peace

PEace is so desirable, that we have suffered our selves to be long misrepresented in hopes that time at least would so abate the Prejudices of our Dissenting Brethren (as the Report calls them) as not to necessitate us to a Publick Vindication of our selves. But to our grief we find that the more we submitted, the more some were incouraged to serve their own purposes, by exposing us and our Ministry. Yet we continued Passive until a Printed Paper, entituled, *A Report of our Differences*: written by some of them as if in the name, if not with the consent, or countenance of the rest, compels us at last, to state Matters of Fact; as they stand, with respect to Doctrinals, between us the United Ministers in and about *London*, and such as have Deserted our Union: which we can freely submit to the Judgment of the unbiass'd Reader, altho we forbear to mention several things, which would irritate more than those we are forced to Recite for our Defence against the Paper we are now taking into Consideration.

The Title it bears is, *A Report of the present State of the Differences in Doctrinals*, &c. But upon Perusal, we find it neither an impartial, clear, nor true Report of those Differences; nor can the design it is to serve be concealed, especially when it is so industriously sent throughout the Kingdom, to impose on such as are unacquainted with our Case. Before we examine the particulars of this Report, it's needful to give an Account of the rise, and progress of our differences, wherein it will appear whether we did any thing to break the Union, or ommitted any thing within our power to induce those Brethren to re-unite, who

had separated from us, or were not inclined to live in Peace, when their unperſwadeableneſs made us ſo unhappy, as to be deprived of their deſired Society.

About the beginning of the Year, 1691. were Publiſhed the *Heads of an Agreement between the Presbyterian and Congregational Miniſters* (as then diſtinguiſh'd *in and about* London, which were drawn up by a number deputed by thoſe of both Denominations: of the firſt were, Mr. *Hamond*, Mr. *How*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr *Stretton* with Dr. *Anneſly* and Mr. *Mayo*, who both of them are now at reſt in the Lord. Of the other were, Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Mead*, Mr. *Chauncey*, Mr. *Lobb*, with Mr. *James* and Mr. *Mather*, which two alſo are now fallen aſleep in the Lord. Theſe Heads of Agreement were Aſſented to (as far as we know,) by all the *Presbyterian* and *Congregational Miniſters* then in and about *London*, except Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, and Mr. *Rich. Taylor*. Among other things, we therein declared, *First*, 'We would meet and Conſult, without the leaſt ſhadow of ſeparate, or diſtinct Parties. *Secondly*, That 'as to what appertains to ſoundneſs of Judgment in 'matters of Faith, we eſteem it ſufficient that a Church 'acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God 'the perfect and only Rule of Faith and Practice; and 'own either the Doctrinal part of the Articles of the '*Church of England*, or the Confeſſion, or Catechiſms 'ſhorter or larger, Compiled by the Aſſembly at *Weſt-*'*minſter*; or the Confeſſion agreed on at the *Savoy* to 'be agreeable to the ſaid Rule.

By the *firſt*, we thought our meetings of Miniſters were ſecured, and oppoſite Meetings prevented. By the latter, we provided, that our Union ſhould not be diſſolved by every different Opinion; eſpecially ſuch as were known to be eſpouſed by Perſons when admitted Members of the Union, as the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Cockain*, &c. This Union was tollerably maintained for a while, notwithſtanding the attempts of ſome

ſome to break it, as we have reaſon to fear, and of others to make it ſerviceable to purpoſes not fit to be mentioned.

About *October*, 1692. Mr. *Chauncey* in a meeting of the united Miniſters after many warm Expreſſions declared, he would leave their meetings, and break off from their Union. The Cauſe he alledged, was our taking no Cognizance of a Paper of Objections, ſubſcribed by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncey*, Mr. *Trayl*, and Mr. *Richard Taylor*, againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book called, *Goſpel Truth Stated*, &c. writen in Confutation of Dr. *Criſps*'s unſound Opinions, which had been reviv'd, and divulged by his Works re printed; to which Book of Mr. *Williams*'s, an Approbation is prefixt with ſeveral of our Names. There were many Reaſons we ſhould take ſmall notice of thoſe Objections in our Meetings, ſeeing that *three* of the *ſix* Objectors were *not of the Union:* The material Objections were not only ungrounded, but they recited as Mr. *Williams*'s Words in his Book, what we found quite contrary to the Letter of his Expreſſions. We might add many more.

But notwithſtanding, we were convinced, That particular Brethrens ſubſcribing Mr. *Williams*'s Confutation of Dr. *Criſp*'s Errors (which were openly propagated to our common Danger and Reproach,) did not affect the Union, nor the united Miniſters *as ſuch*; and therefore could be no juſt cauſe of any Brother's deſerting us; yet we appointed a number of the Brethren to conſider thoſe Objections againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, who together with the Objectors accommodated that Affair, by a Subſcription to certain Doctrinal Propoſitions, of which you have an account, Printed 1693. called, *An Agreement in Doctrinals*; out of which we ſhall only collect theſe Paſſages. *P.* 1. 'Whereas ſome differences have of late ariſen, occaſi-'oned by a Book written by Mr. *Williams*, Entituled,

'*Gospel Truth Stated* (wherein Dr. *Crisps* Works re-
'printed are considered,) and by certain Books writ-
'ten by Mr. *Chauncey* in opposition thereto, and by
'an Approbation of divers of us prefixt to Mr. *Wil-*
'*liams*'s Book, and by a Paper Subscribed
'by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr.
'*Trayl*, and Mr. *R. Taylor*, in conjunction with Mr.
'*Chauncey*: It is hereby declared, that neither they
'who Subscribed that Approbation prefixed to Mr.
'*Williams*'s Book, did therein more than signify (as
'their own Words express,) that they judg'd he had, in
'all that was material, fully and rightly stated the
'Truths and Errors therein mentioned as such, with-
'out delivering their Sense about the Preface, Expli-
'cations, or Proofs thereto belonging; which Decla-
'ration is not to be esteemed as a disapproval of the
'said Preface, Explications, or Proofs.

Here it's plain, that whatever ground of difference was pretended from that Book, or the Approbation to it, was then considered and adjusted; that being the very express and sole matter, which that Agreement refers to: And therefore, how unaccountable is it to maintain Divisions so long after, upon that same pretence?

P. 2. 'We and they say, in order to the composing
'of matters of Controversie, *&c.* We do Subscribe
'these following Propositions, as what do most fully
'provide against the *Arminian*, *Antinomian*, *Socinian*,
'and Popish Errors. *&c.* Here was declared a full pro-
vision against those respective Errors. And is it not strange, that now such Phrases and Words must be the Standard of Orthodoxy, which neither this Agreement, the *Church* of *England*, the Assemblies, nor the confession of any Church require.

P. 15. 'We shall always through *God's gracious assistance*
'in our future Ministry, to our utmost avoid all appear-

ance

ance of oppoſition to one another, ſo as not to hinder or prejudice, but as far as in us lies to promote the ſucceſs thereof, and the common benefit thereby.

When the following behaviour of ſome of our diſſenting Brethren, is obſerved in many ſignal inſtances, it might be well ſuſpected, whether ever they ſubſcribed an engagement ſo ſolemn, or if they did, what can be contrived to oblige them? But that they ſubſcribed; *See p. 16.*

December 16 1692. 'This Day the Brethren, who endeavoured to Accommodate this controverſy, did with Mr. *Williams*, and Mr. *Chauncy*, and theſe other five, who with him objected againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, ſubſcribe to this agreement, and theſe Doctrinal Propoſitions.

Daniel Williams.	*Iſaac Chauncy.*	
Samuel Anneſley.	*John How.*	*Geo. Griffith.*
Math. Barker.	*George Hamond.*	*Thq. Cole.*
Edw. Veal.	*Vincent Alſop.*	*Nath. Mather.*
John James.	*Rich. Mayo.*	*Rob. Trayl.*
Stephen Lob.	*Sam. Slater.*	*Rich. Taylor.*

'On *December* 19. This expedient was brought to a Meeting of the united Miniſters, who unanimouſly expreſſed their approbation in the following words, *Viz.* That thoſe Brethren, who, at the deſire of the United Miniſters, conſidered ſome Objections againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, having brought in the abovementioned expedient, for the Accommodation of the matters in controverſy; the United Miniſters have weighed it, and approve of the ſame. Beſides, it was further declared by them, that whereas the United Miniſters Collectively conſidered, and as ſuch, have not been deſired to approve of Mr. *Williams*'s Book; in like manner, they do not by any thing in

'this agreement, imply an approbation of Mr. *Chauncy*'s Writings in this controversy; Nevertheless they 'do rejoyce, that both Mr. *Williams*, and Mr. *Chauncy*, 'have accepted this offered expedient.

We hoped after this agreement, Union and Peace were well secured: But (alas!) in a little time (without any occasion given on our parts) we found, besides the endeavours of those, who came not into the Union, to prejudice People against us and our Doctrine, as well as against the Union; Several of those called Congregational, who were Members of the Union, frequented not our Meeting, but oft joyned with the former in a Meeting at *Pinners-Hall*, the very day and hour of the Week, in which our Meetings of Ministers are statedly kept. Yea, and some of them in Print reflected on our Meetings in very unbeseeming Terms, as will be made appear if occasion require. Nevertheless, our Zeal for Peace, did not only prevail with us to be silent under these Publick affronts, but set us on making a new Essay for a re-union, about the latter end of the Year 1694. To which end, we appointed a Number to meet, both with the dissenting Brethren, who had left us; and with such, who had always refused to be of us. These dissenting Brethren pretended nothing for their separation, but that there were Erroneous Persons in the Union. To gratify them as to this, the Persons deputed by us, admitted such Provision as pleased those Brethren, against whatever Errors they suspected any of our Number guilty of. This you will find in the former Part of the following Paper, which was brought to our Meeting, as what would satisfy the Dissenters, if assented to by us. Some of us, were sensible of this New Imposition of theirs (against whose Opinions we had so much to object) and the dangerous Consequences of thus Multiplying confessions, as also of favouring such unjust suspicions of our Principles, which we knew they had no Reason for, as

to

any of our Number. Nevertheleſs, we ſubmitted Proſpect of a Coalition; only we finding their Pa-r to want due Proviſion againſt *Criſpian* and *Antino-mian* Errors, which many did Publickly Eſpouſe and bet, we deſired Mr. *How*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Williams*, nd Mr. *Lob*, to ſupply the ſaid defect. The reſult hereof you have in the enſuing Paper, which was un-imouſly agreed to in our Meeting, and ſent from us Mr. *Lob*, to our Diſſenting Brethren; In *Jan.* 7. 1694.

After a Preface it thus follows,

'We the United Miniſters in and about *London*, conſidering of a way whereby to preſerve the Union, and prevent any miſtakes, and remove any prejudices that may ariſe amongſt us, to interrupt the foreſaid Union, do declare, that we ſtill adhere to the Terms thereof, and do ſtill ſubmit to the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith and Practice, and do own the Doctrinal part of thoſe commonly called the Articles of the Church of *England*, or the Confeſſion, ſhorter or larger Catechiſms, compiled by the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*, or the *Savoy* Confeſſion; and do renounce, and teſtify againſt all Opinions and Doctrines diſſonant therefrom; as for inſtance, among many others.

'*Firſt*, That there is no definite Number of Perſons elected from all Eternity, whom God will by his appointed means certainly ſave, and bring to Eternal Life, leaving the reſt who fall under a juſt Condemnation for their Original and Actual Sins, eſpecially for their neglect and contempt of the means of ſalvation. 2. That Chriſt died equally for all Men, not intending the final ſalvation of ſome more than others. *Thirdly*, That Men have in their own Power by the uſe of the Natural Faculties of their reaſon and will, unaſſiſted by the ſpecial Light and Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to perform all that is neceſſary to ſalvation; or that his ſpecial efficacious Light and

' Grace is not neceſſary to their converſion, perſeve
' rance, and final ſalvation. *Fourthly*, That any o
' them whom God hath foreknown, predeſtinated
' and called effectually according to the purpoſe of hi
' Grace, ſhall fall away either totally, or ſo as not t
' be finally glorified *Fifthly*, That Faith, Repen
' tance, a Holy Converſation, or any Act or Wor
' whatever done by us, or wrought by the Spirit o
' God in us, are any part of that Righteouſneſs fo
' the ſake of which, or on the Account whereof, Go
' doth juſtify any Man, or Entitle him to Eterna
' Life.

On the other ſide.

' *Firſt*, That Men are under no obligation to mak
' uſe of their Natural Faculties, with ſuch Externa
' means of ſalvation as God affords them, praying i
' hope, for his Gracious aſſiſtance in order to tha
' bleſſed end. *Secondly*, That God hath not made o
' fers of Grace by Chriſt, to all within the ſound o
' the Goſpel, teſtifying that whoever believeth ſhall b
' ſaved, without excluding any, and commandin
' them to believe accordingly. *Thirdly*, That any ar
' in the ſight of God juſtified, or Entitled to Eterna
' Life, before they are effectually called, or while the
' remain unregenerate, or in unbelief. *Fourthly*, Tha
' any may expect Pardon without Repentance. *Fifthly*
' That continued Repentance towards God, and Faith
' in our Lord Jeſus, and Holyneſs of Heart and Life
' are not in the Nature of the thing, and by the con
' ſtitution of the Goſpel neceſſary to ſalvation. *Sixthly*
' That the Moral Law is not of uſe to unregenerate
' Men, to awaken their Conſciences to fly from th
' wrath to come, and drive them to Chriſt, or that 'ti
' not a rule of Life to them that live under the Goſ
' pel, as well as others. *Seventhly*, That believers fal
' ling into grievous Sins, do not incur Gods diſplea
' ſure; or that they may expect aſſurance otherwiſe

' than

'than by the evidence of those Graces to which the 'promises of salvation are made, and by the Testimo-'ny of the *Spirit* of Adoption witnessing with our 'Spirits, that we are the Children of God. We have 'thought it our Duty to bear our Testimony against 'all these Erroneous Opinions, or any other contrary 'to the plain Tenour of the Gospel of God: And 'we do further protest against any design of undermi-'ning one another in any matter of Church Govern-'ment, but do heartily desire to maintain Communi-'on with each other, according to the Heads of Agree-'ment we have assented to. And if any thing hath 'been done or spoken by any of us, through mistake 'or inadvertency, that may cause any just offence to the 'prejudice of the said Union, we are ready upon bet-'ter information to rectify the same, still desiring and 'continually resolving a Brotherly forbearance towards 'one another, in any lesser points wherein we may 'differ.

Our concern for Union will appear, if it be consider-ed that (to the best of our Knowledge) we retained all the very words sent by them to us, as a guard against each of the Errors, of which they suspected any of us: the Provision we added, is generally in the words of the Assembly, to which we hoped they would be more easily induced to assent, than if we had expressed our selves in other words; and we limited our additions to such Errors as are the other extreme, as to the Arti-cles they had chosen to insist upon, whereas we might have provided against each of Dr. *Crisp*'s Errors.

A good issue of this Paper was expected by many of us. But to our grief it was rejected, and no Answer sent us concerning it to this very day: Yea, a Coaliti-on hereupon was chearfully hoped for by us, even after their Friends had, *Nov.* 7. 1694. Necessitated four of our Number to leave the Lecture at *Pinners-Hall*, and all such of the dissenting Brethren, who were managers of

the

the reiief for Poor Miniſters, had deſerted their Aſſociates with other things, not ſo directly belonging to the Body of United Miniſters, as ſuch. But alas! (as they had generally abſented from us long before) all the Brethren call'd Congregational (except the Reverend and Upright Mr. *Barker*, and a very few more) joyned as a ſeparate Party from us, in the *Monday's* Meeting at *Pinners-Hall*, with the Miniſters who had oppoſed the Union ever ſince it was concluded.

The temper of our Brethrens Spirits, the methods taken to expoſe us, their diſappointing us ſo often, when we thought they had been obliged; And the unſucceſsfulneſs of ſo many probable attempts for Reunion, might well diſcourage any further endeavours; yet when we heard that any of theſe Brethren had the leaſt diſpoſition towards Peace, we applyed our ſelves to an Accommodation. In order thereunto, the Reverend Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Hill*, and Mr. *Slater*, in concurrence with Mr. *How*, and Mr. *Williams*, were deſired to draw up a propoſal, which they brought to our Meeting, as that wherein they were all agreed; and after we had ſeveral days conſidered the ſame, it was unanimouſly aſſented to, and ſent by us in a Letter to our Brethren.

The Paper, by the Report called the third Paper, *which was ſent by the United Brethren to ſuch as had left the Union.*

'WHereas ſome unhappy Differences have ariſen a-
'mong us, principally about the Doctrin of
'Juſtification, as ſet forth in Mr. *Williams*'s Book,
'entituled, *Goſpel Truth Stated*, to which ſeveral of
'our Names are prefixt; we being willing to give all
'reaſonable ſatisfaction therein, for the removing the
'preſent, and preventing all future Differences, which
'will

'will otherwise tend to the dishonour of God, dis-
'quiet of his Churches, and danger of Souls; do here
'by declare our Judgment concerning the same.

'That we adhere to our former Approbation of the
'Doctrinal Articles of the *Church of England*, or Con-
'fession of Faith compiled by the Assembly at *Westminster*, or that at the *Savoy*, as agreeable to the
'word of God, and particularly, to the Articles col-
'lected by us out of the Confession with the Cate-
'chisms compiled by the same Assembly, printed 1693.
'And further declare, That if any shall express him-
'self disagreeably thereto, in any momentous Points of
'Doctrin, we will with Brotherly candour and kind-
'ness endeavour to give, and receive just satisfacti-
'on therein, bearing with one anothers Infirmities,
'and different Sentiments in matters of lesser weight,
'not contending about Logical, or Philosophical
'Terms, or meer Human Forms of Speech, not judging
'it reasonable or just, to charge upon any such conse-
'quences of any expression or opinion of his, which
'he himself shall disown.

'And we further declare, as to the special matters
'in difference.

I. Concerning Justification. That altho the express word
'of God do assert the necessity of Regeneration, to our
'entring into the Kingdom of God; and requires Re-
'pentance, that our Sins may be blotted out; and Faith
'in Christ, that we may be justified; and Holiness of
'Heart and Life, without which we cannot see God.
'Yet that none of these, or any work done by Men, or
'wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is, under any
'Denomination whatsoever, any part of the Righ-
'teousness for the sake, or on the account whereof, God
'doth pardon, justifie, or accept Sinners, or entitle
'them to Eternal Life, that being only the Righteous-
'ness of Christ without them, imputed to them, and
'received by Faith alone.

II. 'Of

II. 'Of a Commutation of Persons between Christ 'and us. As we are to consider our Lord Jesus 'Christ in his Obedience, and Sufferings, as God and 'Man, invested with the Office of Mediator; So it is 'apparent, this Commutation of Persons with us was 'not natural, in respect of either nature, by which his 'Individual Substance should become ours, and ours 'his; nor Moral, in respect of Qualities, or Actions, 'whereby he should become inherently Sinful, and we 'immediately Sinless. Nor was it any change where-'by his office of Mediator should be transfered on us. But 'it is to be understood in a Legal, or Judicial Sense (as 'we may call it) *viz.* He by agreement between the 'Father and Him, came into our room and stead, not 'to repent and believe for us, which the Gospel re-'quires of us as our Duty (tho he hath undertaken the 'Elect shall in due time be inabled thereto) But to an-'swer for our violation of the Law of Works: *He 'being made sin for us, that knew no sin, that we might be 'made the righteousness of God in him.* 2 Cor. 5 21.

III. 'Of God's being pleased or displeased with Christ, as standing, and suffering in our stead. We 'judge that God was always pleased with Christ, both in his Person, and execution of all his Offices, which is expresst most particularly in that of his Priestly, 'Office John 17, 18. *Therefore doth my father love me, because 'I lay down my life*, &c. And no otherwise displeased 'than as having a dispassionate Will to inflict upon him 'the punishment of our Sins, which he had undertaken to bear, that God might, without injury to his 'Justice or Honour, pardon and save penitent Believers, 'for his satisfaction, and Intercession founded thereon.

'Mr. *Williams* freely declareth his Concurrence 'with us in these three particulars, and that his Judg-'ment was never contrary to the sence of this Paper, 'for which he appeals to the said Book: So it is mani-'fest, that when he useth the phrase of no change of

Persons

'Person between Christ and the Elect, it could not be 'intended as a denial of a change of Persons between 'Christ and us in the General Sence, but only in opposi- 'tion to the Opinion of his adversary he wrote against, 'for in that very place he expresly affirms, *That Christ 'suffer'd and dyed in our Room, and stead.* And we do 'declare, that whosoever shall be found, to express 'themselves in their Preaching or Writing agreeably 'to this Paper, and to the mentioned Articles or Con- 'fessions, we shall esteem them to deliver the sincere 'Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and it 'shall be remote from us to oppose or reflect upon, but 'we shall to our utmost Encourage, and give Counte- 'nance to one anothers Ministry therein.

'Such of us, whose Names are prefixed to the said Book, do declare they were given to the State of 'Truth and Errors, as formerly expresst in the Paper, 'intituled, *The agreement in Doctrine*, Subscribed and 'Published, *Anno Dom.* 1692.

They who framed this Proposal had before them two Papers, one which the report calls the first Paper, which one of our Brethren had with great Condescension and Inclination to Peace, concerted with some of the Dissenters: Which Paper, altho it was never proposed to, nor read in any of our Publick Meetings of Ministers, and was unanimously agreed to be laid aside with a Second Paper, that had been brought unto us by another Brother; Yet it's manifest, the Brethren in the framing of this Third (which is our only Paper) greatly Accommodated themselves to the Model of the first: For they admit a new Debate concerning Mr. *Williams*'s Book, after a Solemn Accommodation of that whole matter, when the Dissenters had unjustly made it an occasion of difference so many Years before; they also recite two Passages of Mr. *Williams*, as excepted against by the Dissenters, and limit the Declaration of our Judgment to the *Three Heads*, the Objectors did

did chooſe to inſiſt upon, whereas you will preſently read a Vote of us united Miniſters, wherein we require a diſowning of very many *Antinomian* Errors, Publiſhed by ſeveral of theſe Diſſenters, whenever they ſhall make the diſowning of any Paſſages out of Books Written againſt *Antinomianiſm*, a Term of Union. Yea further, we retain the whole Proviſion of the Firſt Paper, againſt any of our ſurmized Errors in the Doctrine of Juſtification, and what we add is in Scripture Words. And in the other two Heads, we come as near as we can with Truth, and Freedom from Ambiguity, in Points of ſo great Concernment, and in a time when ſo many are at work to Propagate *Criſpianiſm*, and *Antinomianiſm*. A Coalition could be no indifferent thing to ſuch, who to obtain it do thus condeſcend, and deny themſelves. But to give our attempt a yet greater advantage, we omitted not to addreſs our ſelves to our Brethren, with the moſt affectionate, fervent, and humble intreaties, and ſupplications, as well as perſwaſive Arguments; as you will ſee in this Letter which we ſent to them, with the foremention'd Paper.

Note, *It was declared, that by the words* [under any Denomination whatſoever] *we exclude all Righteouſneſs from being Meritorious, or Attoning, yea, or a procuring Cauſe of theſe benefits; none is at all ſo, but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. But we intended not to exclude what the Goſpel requireth in order to our interſt, in thoſe benefits given for the ſake of Chriſts Righteouſneſs.*

TO

To our Reverend, and duely Reſpected, and Beloved Brethren *in our common Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt,* Mr. Griffith, Mr. Mead, Mr. Chauncey, Mr. James, Mr. Lobb, *and the reſt of the Brethren of the Union, (who for ſome time.) have forborn to meet with the United* Miniſters *at Dr.* Anneſley's *Meeting Place.*

Reverend Brethren,

YOUR forbearing to meet with us at our ordinary times and places for ſo many months, hath made a deep, and ſmarting impreſſion on our Spirits, and filled our Hearts with Grief and Wonder. With Grief, becauſe we have been ſo long deprived of much of that Satisfaction and Aſſiſtance, which your preſence with us was wont to afford us. With Wonder, becauſe we could neither apprehend nor receive any certain Information of thoſe Reaſons, which prevailed with you, to keep off ſo long from our Conventions. For to this day you never acquainted us, directly, and clearly, of any Offence that was ever offered to you, by the united Miniſters, as ſtanding in that Capacity, had you been pleaſed to ſignifie your Reſentments to them. they take themſelves to have been obliged to have ſought out proper ways and means for the removal of all Prejudices, and of rendring to you, reaſonable and due ſatisfaction. All the light that we have received about matters in difference between us, hath been from a reverend Brother, who told us, that by Conference with ſome who forbear to come to our Meetings, he under-

under ſtood, that they apprehended, there are thoſe in our Union, who have Sentiments about the Doctrin of Juſtificati on, different from the common Faith of all Orthodox Proteſtants, and ſo diſſonant from the Holy Scriptures, and the Confeſſions, which have been owned an d approved by us. The ſame Brother added, that if there were ſufficient Evidence and Aſſurance given them, that the Body of the United Miniſtsrs would approve themſelves, ſound, clear, and ſtedfaſt in that moſt weighty and important Doctrin (which we all acknowledge to be *Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis Eccleſiæ*,) they would then maintain all Brotherly communion with us. When this was noti fied to us, we preſently conceived great and good Hopes, that all Jealouſies might be eaſily removed, and that a Redintegration of Affections would immediately follow. And what ſhould hinder? For if you do attentively, and deliberately weigh what is Aſſerted in the Article of Juſtification, in the incloſed Paper, (which was unanimouſly agreed unto, after open Reading, and that upon ſeveral Days) we are confident, that it will evidently and undeniably appear, that we perfectly agree with our Brethren in the Evangelical Doctrin of Juſtification, even in the very Phraſes and Modes of Expreſſion.

Our Agreement in the Doctrin of Juſtification, which was as the Teſt and Cement of our Union, being ſo happily Eſtabliſhed and fixed; we ſhall need to ſay but little, touching the other two points mentioned in the incloſed Paper: which (as we think) are ſo clearly and candidly ſtated, that we believe, (as we ſuppoſe, upon ſure and certain grounds) there will be nothing remaining (upon that account) to obſtruct our entire and hearty Union

It would be ſuperfluous to lay before you any conſiderations to ſet forth the deſirableneſs, uſefulneſs, we may add the neceſſity of Miniſterial Concord: Or to repreſent the ſin, and miſchief that will inſeparably cleave

cleave to our unbrotherly breaches. We all find (by ſad experience) what advantage is given thereby, to ſome who ſeek occaſion to reproach us, and to hinder the ſucceſs, or acceptableneſs of our Miniſtry. They do certainly wiſh, and will endeavour to make our wound incurable. But we truſt, the Lord will blaſt their Deſigns, and Fruſtrate their Expectations, by enlightning our Minds, to receive and hold faſt all Truths, and ſpecially thoſe which are Fundamental: And by his Grace, moſt ſweetly and effectually draw our Hearts to Love as Brethren: That we may cloſely, ſtrongly, and intimately knit-together in inviolable Bonds: And ſo Guide us, that we may all follow after the things that make for Peace, and the things wherewith one may edify another.

And now (Dear Brethren) we do, with all ſincerity and ardor, beſeech you to meet us with the like Frame of Spirit; that our only Emulation and Contention may be, who ſhall be moſt Induſtrious to promote the intereſt of our Lord Redeemer: Be moſt uſeful to the Souls we are ſet to watch over: And be moſt forward to embrace each other in the Arms of Love.

That theſe Bleſſed Ends may be the more effectually purſued, we do (with all importunity and fervor) beſeech you to return to and frequent our Meetings, as ye have formerly done: That we may joyn with you there, in your Holy Prayers: Be aſſiſted with your wholeſome Counſels, and be refreſhed with your much deſired Society: That we may with one Mind, and one Mouth Glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. *Amen.*

If, after the peruſal of the incloſed Paper, ye meet with any thing therein that may ſeem to need further Explanation: And ye be willing to entertain a Conference about it: Be pleaſed to appoint the time and place, when and where, a determinate Number of the United Miniſters, may meet with a like Number of

the Brethren Nominated by you, and we shall most readily and chearfully comply with your Proposal. Howbeit, we must add, That we hope, we have already set down our sentiments, as Nakedly and Perspicuously as we could express, in pursuance of our End, which was to give you all possible satisfaction—We conclude this Paper with two earnest requests to you. (1.) Upon the hopes which you have conceived, that (thro' the Grace and Blessing of our God) the differences which have risen among us, will be brought to an happy composure: We importunately beseech you, to use your uttermost Endeavours, to perswade these Brethren who have not as yet entred into our Union, that they will joyn with us in it. (2.) That you would (assoon as conveniently you can) vouchsafe us an Answer to this our Letter.

Finally, Brethren Farewell, *Be Perfect, be of Good Comfort, Be of one Mind, Live in Peace: And the God of Love and Peace shall be with you.* Signed at Dr. *Annesley's*, October 27. 1696. By Mr. *Hammond* Moderator.

To our Letter so Submissive, Peaceable, and Importunate, we received this and no other Answer.

Reverend Brethren,

HAving received from you a Letter with a Paper inclosed, in Answer thereunto suffer us to acquaint you, that a Paper Subscribed by a considerable Number of you, and approved of by us some Months since, which we have Reason to believe some of you have had the perusal of; we therefore to whom your Letter is directed, do not reckon it Brotherly in us to forsake them who have Subscribed the foresaid Paper, but do rather

ther Judge our ſelves bound in Conſcience to entreat ur hearty Concurrence with them, and us, in that ſt Paper; which, as we have already ſaid, hath been bſcribed by very Principal and Reverend Miniſters, ghly eſteemed both by you and us: and this we hope, ay, through the Bleſſing of God, be the ſpeedieſt way obtain the deſirable End.

Subſcribed in the Name of ſeveral of the Brethren, to whom your Letter was Communicated.

THis is the Letter our reporter Complains we gave no reply to, wherein we think we paid a great gard to them who ſent it, and we ſhall ſtill overlook otherwiſe than to Note, *Firſt*, It is more than obable ſome of us peruſed, what a *conſiderable* Num- er of us Subſcribed. *Secondly*, Our Brethren who ubſcribed, could not Judge it unbrotherly, to be for- aken for laying aſide the firſt Paper, when every one them had laid it aſide before, and joyned in the ird Paper, and in the Letter whereto this Anſwer is ven (which it's ſtrange any of the Diſſenters could ignorant of.) *Thirdly*, What is the *deſirable End*? ad they ſaid Union, it would have been more accep- ble to us, than it ſeemed to be to ſuch of themſelves, o declared in one of the Meetings about this expe- ent, that it was not intended by this attempted a- reement, that they would joyn with us in our Meet- gs as United Miniſters, but that an agreement in octrine might be a ſtep to further Union: Yea, we ſcarce hope they would have re-united, could we e ſubmitted to their Papers, becauſe, as we are infor- d, Mr. *Cole* and Mr. *Mather* refuſed their aſſent to And this their Letter was ſubſcribed in the Name, of *ſeveral* (not of all) to whom it was Communica- ; nor (as we find) was any Union, or Agreement gaged, or expreſſed, except in Doctrine, had this ex-

pedient obtained. This is the true State of the ca
between our Brethren and us: Could we have obtai
ed a re-union upon mutual forbearance wherein we di
fer: Had any of these Accounts of our Principles s
tisfied them; (Tho' we therein admit so rigid and fu
a Tryal wherein they suspected us, and propose so v
ry short and easy a Test when we affirm the Trut
denied by them) Had our importunity for Peace, atte
ded with much Patience and Condescention, been a
cepted; the mischievous effects of our differences h
been prevented. Nor can we guess what would pr
vail with the Authors of these Divisions, unless tha
Book should be disowned, which, the Subscribers a
convinced, is of great use for the Defence of the Go
pel in a time abounding with Errors: And such Trut
betrayed, as the usefulness of our Ministry and Prac
cal Religion depend upon: things we are sure Chr
would not approve, nor could we expect a Peace
bought to prove a Blessing.

We were well assured, that a faithful Account of t
State of things among us, must acquit us of the bla
of those unhappy differences, and prevent the adva
tages some made by mis-representing us: Neverth
less, we had still remained silent, if this so unjust a
port (with a Paper of remarks following it) had n
been obtruded on the World, and with Art scatter
throughout the Kingdom, yea, sent to Foreign Na
ons as can be proved; after this, indeed our silen
would proclaim us stupidly insensible and unconcern
for the common Good, as well as for our own repu
tion and usefulness.

We shall proceed to consider what is material in t
Report.

First, The Report saith, *Our differences may be re
ced to Christs satisfaction and the Penal Sanction of
Law*; *tho' hitherto, the greatest struggle hath been about t
first.*

Ans

Answ. 1. The first was no part of the difference till of late, that Mr. *Lobb* contrived to make it so, tho' without any Reason; for Mr. *Williams* rightly and fully asserted the first in his Books. And the utmost that can be made of the latter is, that Mr. *Williams* asserts that if the Precepts of the Law of Works be considered, as taken into the Gospel, they fall under the Gospel Sanction; and tho' in this respect there is a change of the Sanction, yet the Precepts considered still as a part of the Law of Works, they are under the *same Legal Sanction as at first*, which is to say, The Covenant of Works and the Gospel Covenant differ. And yet this seems to be reserved for a New Controversy, if we had agreed to their very mode of expressing the point he insisteth on.

Answ. 2. It's a very great mistake, that our difference with them is reduced to these two points, alas! it extends to many other things (*Viz.*) *Most of Dr. Crisp's Opinions*, as to which they refuse to give us satisfaction, tho' he granteth these two are all they quarrel with us about, and how unjustly will presently be seen. We shall detect his mistake by a brief Narrative.

1. The difference Originally appeareth to be about most of those Positions, called Truths and Errors in the State of them in Mr. *Williams*'s Book; for Six of the Dissenters did not only object some particular Passages; but they deny those to be *Truths* which are called *Truths*, and such to be *Errors* which are called *Errors*, In the 2. 5. 7. 8. 12. 16. 18. and 19. Chapters of that Book: Yea, they say, *They find not Truth and Error rightly Stated in other places besides these*; Thus they say, Mr. *Chauncyes Neonomianism unmasked*, Par. 3. p. 96. Whereas many of our Brethren Subscribed, that each of these were rightly Stated. He that will Read the Truths and Errors in those several Chapters, may judge of the difference, and whether any of Dr. *Crisp*'s Errors will be disowned. 2. In the forcited Articles

1694. You'll find that when we had owned such to be Errors, which they required of us, yet they refused to disown those Errors which we added; and therefore the difference at that time, respected whatever they refused to agree with us in, and was not ever since Accommodated. 3. The Reporter cannot be Ignorant, that *September* 15. 1695. 'This Vote unanimously passed among the United Brethren, upon reading a Paper relating to several dangerous Expressions in favour of *Antinomianism*, if that any thing objected out of Books written against *Antinomianism* be required to be disowned as a Term of Union, that those things read this Day, and further to be Collected of that kind out of the Books *on the other side*, shall be required to be disowned.

Some things Collected out of the Books of Mr. Chauncy, *Mr.* Cole, Mr. Mather, *and* Mr. Trail.

'TO talk of a Gospel threat, is a *Catechresis* at best, and nothing else can save it from being a *Bull*. Pardon is rather the Condition of Faith, and much more having a causal influence thereunto, than Faith and Repentance are of Pardon. It was sin, as the ἀνομίαι that Christ bore, the fault of sin was laid upon Christ, the sin it self as opposed to guilt. Christ was reputed a Criminal, not only by Man, but by God. As to the Elect, there was never any Guilt upon them, in respect of the Righteous Judgment of God, in *foro Dei*, but that which Accompanied the Letter of the Law, setting in with the Conscience. Justification is before effectual Vocation—The Doctrine of Justification before Faith is not an Error, but a Great and Glorious Truth. Justification in regard

gard of Application must be before believing—The first Application, *ordine naturæ saltem*, is to an ungodly Man, *eo nomine* that he may believe; we believe that we may be justified declaratively. It is denied, that God requires Faith as an Indispensible Qualification in them, whom he will justify for Christs merits—He denies that unbelief is the Cause why Men are barred from Justification, and Obnoxious to Misery. He saith, you talk of an offer to the Non elect, and that offer you say must be serious, *&c.* But I Pray, where is any offer of Grace to the Non-elect at all, as such. And shew me any Grace given, or Gospel Duties required of the Non-elect, or Benefits promised to the Non-elect, upon their performance of Grace and Duties, *&c.* And what if the Non-elect be in as bad a Case as the Devils, Is God bound to be any better to them than to the Devils? God hath not said, I will save a Non-elect Person if he believe, more than he hath said, a Horse shall be a Man, if he can use Reason, or speak, or a Man shall be a Horse if he hath four Feet. God was reconciled to the elect at Christs Death, but we are reconciled to God by the Gospel Ministry. Union with Christ is before Faith, at least *Naturæ*, and we partake of the Spirit by Virtue of that Union: there is a Compleat Union with Christ before the Act of Faith. All that a believer can pray for, is the further manifestation of Pardon, for he knows that all his sins are Pardoned. A believer is to work from Life and not for Life. It's a great Truth that God sees no sin in a believer, sin can do no real hurt to a believer. God is not displeased with his People, and is not angry with the Persons of believers, for their sins. Legal Convictions before saving Faith are no more than sin, it's but the Filthy Conscience polluting guilt of sin. There is no Preparatory work distinct from

'Gods Act in effectual Calling. The Gospel is no 'Rule of Judgment, that's the Law only. The Gos-'pel is not any part of the Rule of Judgment at the 'last day, that's only the Law of Creation. Denies 'that, at the Judgment Day there will be a Tryal, up-'on which some will be justified, others Condemned. 'Christs Precepts are not Laws with a Sanction. Ap-'proves of these words, sanctification is not the way 'of a justified Person to Heaven — If you look upon 'Graces and Duties, and Salvation, as two distinct 'things, I deny that they are necessary to give a right 'to Salvation. All imperfect Holiness is sin. *Turn 'ye, turn ye, why will you dye?* Is but the Triumph of 'the Law over a Dead sinner. An unsaved Person can 'do nothing in order to salvation. God was displea-'sed with Christ as our surety: We in Christ satisfied 'the Justice of God. We through Christs Righteous-'ness have a right to Glory, by *Adams* Covenant. '*Adam* for one good work, should have entred into 'full possession and a confirmation therein. To teach 'that a Christian upon the Actings of Graces, and 'Performance of Duties, may in the Virtue of the pro-'mise made to the exercise of those Graces or Duties, 'expect any of those promised Blessings, is to teach a 'low and servile Spirit.

'The Eternal Life in which the Angels were Created 'and Confirmed by Christ, differs from that Eternal 'Life which believers have in Christ; the one is a Crea-'ture Life, or a Created Life, the other is the Eter-'nal Life of God Communicated in time. Believers 'are as Righteous as Christ, I mean not in a way of Si-'militude, but in a way of Equality. Christs Incarna-'tion was no part of his Humiliation; we Coalesce 'upon believing into one mystical Person with Christ, 'which is distinguisht from Legal Union, which is be-'fore Faith. The Gospel hath no Law-Sanction, it's 'plainly denied that the Gospel is a Law of Grace.

'Faith

Faith is neither a Condition nor Qualification in the Office of Juſtification; with ſeveral things of the ſame ſort as above recited.

'Moſt of theſe were then included in the Paper, the Vote refers to; which with the other things further Collected, ſhall be proved to be in the Printed Books of the foreſaid Authors, and Book and Page cited for each, when it ſhall be required. Yea, a great deal more, if not worſe, of the ſame ſort.

By theſe things it's manifeſt what the difference is about, tho' a noiſe hath been raiſed about things remote from the true occaſion, that while we ſeemed to be only on the defenſive part, their Errors might receive Countenance as if unoppoſed, and the abettors thereof might leſs appear the cauſe of our Diviſions.

Anſw. 3. Altho' our Brethren from a Zeal for Peace condeſcended to mention but three particulars in the third Paper, yet it's too evident, that the Diſſenters adhere to their own Paper (called the firſt) and refuſe ours, becauſe this doth provide ſome Defence againſt ſome of the Errors, which our difference is about, (the ſame cauſe for which they rejected the Articles in 1694.) And it's plain by what their Paper ſaith of Juſtification, they had this our Paper of Ninety four before them, and therefore muſt know, that we inſiſted under that Head to have it clearly expreſſed, 'That none 'are juſtified in the ſight of God, or Entitled to Eter-'nal Life, before they are effectually called, or whilſt 'they are unregenerate, or in unbelief; And that Men muſt repent in order to forgiveneſs; as alſo that continued Repentance, Faith and Holyneſs of Heart, and Life, are by the conſtitution of the Goſpel, as well as in the Nature of the things themſelves, neceſſary to ſalvation, *&c.* Our Diſſenting Brethren knew this, and yet inſert nothing in that firſt Paper ſufficient to this purpoſe. By the Reporters arguing againſt us, their not mentioning thoſe things is their diſowning of them,

and

and owning the contrary, yea, we have more reason to infer thus, because what they omit was sent by the body of United Ministers to them as a mean of Union, whereas, what's omitted by us, was not sent to us, much less to that end, nor adjusted by our appointment. But we need not to insist on this, when by comparing the first and third Papers, it's evident, that the foresaid Errors are inconsistent with the few variations in our Paper, bnt very consistent with theirs, tho' not in the sense designed by our Subscribing Brethren.

In the first part of the Head of Justification, their Paper saith, Repentance, Faith, and a Holy Conversation, are by Gods expres's word manifestly necessary to *Salvation*. They do not say, Repentance is necessary to *Pardon*, nor Faith to *Justification*, tho' that be the Head treated of: No, these are necessary to no more than a Holy Conversation is necessary to, *i. e.* to Eternal Salvation: nor do they say, that the necessity of these to salvation it self is by the Gospel Constitution, or any enacted Connexion between Duty and Benefit. Things being thus worded, it may pass with such who tell us, the Gospel hath neither Precept, Threatning, nor Conditional promise: Repentance is not antecedently necessary to Pardon, nor Faith to the Justification of our Persons, but only to *manifest* to our Consciences for our inward Peace, that our Persons were justified before God whilst in our unbelief. But such things are prevented by our Paper, which saith, *That the Word of God requires Repentance, that our Sins may be blotted out, and Faith that we may be justified*; And afterwards, the Gospel requires of us as our Duty, that we repent and believe, and God Pardons penitent Believers. In like manner, their Paper in the other Heads expresseth things so, as that such may subscribe it, who think the filth and fault of sin were Transacted on Christ, he was the Criminal, the Murtherer, *&c.* in Gods Account; that God was *really displeased* with Christ,

Christ, and abhorred him as our surety; tho' not considered in himself: and sundry the like (that our Paper gives no Countenance to) which our subscribing Brethren do abhor.

It's not then without Reason, that the *Dissenters* insist on the first Paper; whether they be such who hold those Errors, or resolve to indulge such as do so. And yet there wants not Art in placing the differences upon our omitting a Phrase in the third Paper, wherein the true sense of it is expressed; for the Reporter well saw, a quarrel with us for the *omission* of a Phrase of so uncertain a sense, is as yet more plausible, than their struggle for Errors of so ill a sound would be.

Answ. 4. But if the Doctrines about which we differ are not yet sufficiently evident, we shall with a desire of Union make this proposal; If our Dissenting Brethren will declare their agreement with us. *First*, That Repentance towards God, is Commanded in order to Remission of Sin. *Secondly*, That Faith in Christ is Commanded by the Gospel, in order to the Justification of our Persons before God, for the sake of the alone Righteousness of Christ. *Thirdly*, That the Word of God requires perseverance in true Faith and Holyness, that we may be Partakers of the Heavenly Glory. *Fourthly*, That the Gospel promiseth Pardon through the Blood of Christ to the penitent, Justification before God to the Believer, and the Heavenly Glory to such as persevere in Faith and Holyness; and also declareth that God will not Pardon the Impenitent, justify the Unbeliever, nor glorify the Apostate or Unholy. *Fifthly*, That justifying Faith is not only a perswasion of the understanding, but also a receiving and resting upon Christ alone for Salvation. *Sixthly*, That by *change of Person is meant*, that whereas we were Condemned for our sins, the Lord Jesus was substituted in our Room, to bear the *Punishment* of our sins, for the satisfaction of *Divine Justice*, *That whoever*

ver believes on him may be acquitted and saved; But it is not intended, that the *Filth* of sin was upon Christ, nor that he was a *Criminal* in Gods Account. *Seventhly*, That by Christs being our *surety* is meant, that Jesus Christ our Mediator obliged himself to expiate our sins by his Blood, and to purchase Eternal Life for all that believe, and Faith and every saving Grace for the Elect; but it's not intended, that we were legally reputed to make satisfaction, or purchase Eternal Life. *Eighthly*, That by Christs Answering for us, the *Obligations* of the violated Law of Works is intended, that whereas the Law obliged us to dye for our sins, Christ became obliged to dye in our stead, and whereas we were, after we had sinned, still obliged to yield perfect obedience; Christ perfectly obeyed the Law, that upon the Account of his Active and Passive obedience believers might be forgiven, and entituled to Eternal Life: but it's not intended that the Sense of the Law of Works should be, that if we, or Christ obeyed we should live, and if Christ suffered we should not dye, *tho' we sinned*: Nor that Believers are justified, or to be judged by the *Law of Works*, but by the Gospel; altho' the Righteousness for the sake of which they are justified, be as perfect as that Law of Works required, and far more valuable.

If our Dissenting Brethren will Subscribe to these Propositions and Explications, we will subscribe with them even to the Words, Change of Persons, surety, and Answering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of Works, as well as we have already subscribed that no work done by Men, nor wrought by the Spirit of God in them, Is any part of that Righteousness for the sake, or on the Account whereof we are justified, that being only the Righteousness of Christ without us, imputed to us, and received by Faith alone, which is the procuring cause of all saving Good. How gladly would

would we Re-unite with them, might this but remove the difference!

And since we are content, to use their very Words and Phrases explained in the Orthodox Sense (the omission whereof is, what is excepted against us) we hope, that such of the Dissenters as shall refuse to agree with us, will not hereafter say, that a difference in the Doctrines pretended by the Report, is the Reason why they unite not with us: But Acknowledge, that they keep up the differences from their Zeal for the foresaid Opinions of Dr. *Crisp* and the *Antinomians*, which we think to be very Erroneous.

Secondly, *The Report saith, that the third Paper was taken and sent from some who meet at Little St.* Hellens.

Answ. These *some* had with them all of our Brethren, who subscribed the first Paper, yea, several of them were the Framers of it, as well as the whole Body of the United Ministers (as far as we know) consented to it.

Thirdly, *The Reporter gives the Reasons why the Dissenters did not approve of the third Paper, which are these.*

'1. He saith the third Paper omitted to mention, 'that a Change of Persons is the common Doctrine of 'Protestants, and that neither Justification nor Christs 'satisfaction can be duly explained, or defended with-'out it, and that *Grotius* and the Reverend Bishop of '*Worcester* have proved a Change of Persons, *p.* 4.

Answ. 1. The third Paper asserts a Commutation of Persons, therefore we wonder he, *p.* 5. affirms, that we have not mentioned it, but having therein fully asserted it in opposition to *Socinianism*, is it not strange our Paper should be scrupled, because we duly explained Justification and Christs satisfaction thereby, but did not say, *They could not be explained without it*, &c. Which tho' we may think, yet the meer saying so is not the hinge of the Controversy, nor would it add any strength to the

the hedge which we have made without it; or else surely, some of our Protestant Confessions would at least have made mention thereof, and therefore these Brethren must reject every one of those, as well as ours.

Answ. 2. We have affirmed and explained a Change of Persons in the same Sense, as *Grotius* and the Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet* Bishop of *Worcester*, have done (as will appear to any who consult those Authors) but they are far from approving the *Crispian* Explication of that Phrase, as we shall evidence by a Letter of the said Reverend Bishop to Mr. *Williams*.

Answ. 3. As we durst not imitate the Reporters liberty, perswading the World, we denyed and rejected a Commutation or Change of Persons, when we asserted it in expres's Terms, so we assure him, we designed not to offend our Brethren, who, he saith, *p. 6.* are *grieved* because our Letter saith, *That on our so happy establishing the Doctrine of Justification, we need say but little in the Point of Commutation of Persons.* By which words it's plain we meant not, that we said little of it in our *Paper*, where in the second and third Heads we said enough to clear it, even twice more than what we said of Justification: But we say little of it in our *Letter*, where we have enlarged on Justification; because for several Years the Dissenters pretended all their great Quarrel was about that Doctrine; and may not we justly grieve that for our Industry, in clearing our selves beyond all their Challenges as to this, we should be Hereticated by this Report in the New Controversy, started by Mr. *Lobb*?

The Second Reason occurs so often, that we cannot avoid Answering it again and again.

3. Reason, *There is such a wrong Description given of a Change of Person in the Third Paper, as perverts the Doctrine of satisfaction*, p. 6. *yea*, p. 7. *It tells us, Christ did not, yea, could not make satisfaction upon what you affirm.*

Answ.

Answ. 1. We shall first enquire what description the Reporter gives of a Change of Persons, which is such as must with wise Men justify our careful expressing our Sense of this Phrase, *p.* 7. He saith, 'a Commutation is the same with a proper Surrogation, where the surety puts on the *Quality, State, and Condition of the Debtor*, p. 5. He tells us, we are all by Nature under 'the Curse of the Law, *And destitute of a Righteousness Entituling to Eternal Life*, and addeth, this is our State and Condition, this is the place we are in; a few Lines after he saith, that Christ put himself into our 'Place, State and Condition, so that whereas *We were 'sin and under a Curse, by this blessed change Christ was 'made sin and a Curse.* Here he plainly expresseth his sense of the Change of Persons: As to what he speaks of Christs being a Curse, we object not further than that Christ was not *so by Nature*; but the things we observe are, that he saith, *Our State Place and Condition was*, that we were destitute of a Righteousness, Entituling to Eternal Life; this was it: He saith, that Christ put himself into this our State, Place and Condition; if so, then with him Christ was destitute of a Righteousness, Entituling to Eternal Life. To make this more evident, he saith, *we were Sin*, this was our Place, State and Condition, into which Christ put himself; and by this change was *made sin*: Now, how were we sin? We were not a sin-offering but sinful vile offenders; we were sinful and destitute of all Righteousness, that was our Condition; yet he saith, Christ came into our condition as we were sin; which must be, that he was changed to be a sinful vile offender, not an *offering* for sin, for that was not our Condition: By which it's evident, our Reporters Commutation of Persons is not, that Christ became a sin offering, and in our stead subject to the punishments, which by the Law Sinners deserved, that they might be delivered. No, that will not content him; But that Christ was changed to be a sinful Person,

Perſon, deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs Entituling to Eternal Life; this is his change, this is his Chriſts taking on him *the Perſon of Sinners*; which is a poſition not only unworthy of the Praiſes he beſtows on it, *p.* 5. But ſo horrid, that we hope, ſome of our Diſſenting Brethren will be provoked to clear themſelves from the Imputation, this Reporter ſeems fond to lay them under.

Anſw. 2. The Arguments muſt be ſtrong by which he ſaith, *Our Account of a change of Perſon is attaqued*, if they will prove that we have thereby perverted the Doctrine of ſatisfaction, yea, and rendred it impoſſible. Whether the Arguer and Reporter be the ſame Perſon, we enquire not, but of the ſame Spirit none can doubt: In return whereto, we wiſh them more Charity and Modeſty for the future: However, ſome might expect they would have conſulted their own Credit ſo far, as not to Proclaim the very ſame Men, the moſt Learned and moſt Orthodox, and yet very Ignorant and Groſsly Heretical: And that as to the very ſame Point: The firſt Character the Reporter beſtows on them, for ſubſcribing the firſt Paper; yet it abates nothing to them of the laſt, ſeeing they will frame and approve of the Third Paper. But it greatly concerns all of us, to peruſe the Arguments which follow.

Arg. 1. When we Diſcourſe of a Commutation, we ſhould conſider Chriſt (who is inveſted with the Office of Mediator) as our ſurety in the Execution of his Prieſtly Office, *&c.* But wording it as they do, is Calculated for their *Meridian*, who hold Chriſt ſuffered only in the Perſon of a Mediator not in the Perſon of Sinners: For which Reaſon we may perceive, why there muſt not be the leaſt mention of Chriſts ſuretyſhip in the Third Paper.

Anſw. 1. Chriſts ſuretyſhip did not diveſt him of the Office of his Mediatorſhip, but Connotes, that as Mediator he engaged himſelf to ſuffer for *Condemned Sinners*,

ners, yea, and to do much more for them, than what's included in the Execution of his Prieſtly Office, (*Viz.*) To teach them, overcome their Enemies, *&c.* Nay more, all Chriſts ſufferings, as a Prieſt, were his ſufferings. as one mediating for Sinners, and not one become himſelf a Sinner; as he is repreſented to be, by making ſuch a vaſt difference between him as our Mediator, and as ſurety.

Anſw. 2. Tho' we mention not the word *Surety* (which we Scruple not) yet we did plainly expreſs the thing deſigned by that Word, as far as belongs to a *ſubſequent* ſurety in *Criminal* Cauſes (tho not pecuniary) and as is couſiſtent with Chriſts being a Mediator, in all his Engagements and Performances for us. A diſregard to both which occaſioneth ſuch confuſed and miſtaken Notions concerning theſe Doctrines.

Arg. 2. Their Account of a Commutation is: It's to be underſtood in a Legal or Judicial Senſe, as we may call it; not that it is really ſo, only we may ſo call it.

Anſw. 1. *As we may call it*, Is not oppoſed to really, but we uſe it as an Apology for the Term Judicial added to Legal, and as unſcriptural; we mean that wherein Chriſt ſuffered, he was judicially dealt with, as if he had been the *Condemned Sinners*, in whoſe Room he ſuffered; But knowing that many give a dangerous ſenſe of the Word Legal, when without Explication or Limitation, we added judicial thereto.

Anſw. 2. The Reporter might have ſpared ſaying, *They'll not Quarrel about the Term, may the thing they contend for be granted them.* Inſtead of complaining of a diſreſpect to Fifty or Sixty Miniſters, we'll deſire all our Brethren were as temperate, which would End all Quarrels about Humane Words, when the *Senſe* is granted; nor would this diſparage the Reporter, who ſeems ſo fond of a ſet of Words, as if he highly valued himſelf, for his diſcovery of them to his Aſſociates;

and therefore he will contend for them ſo ſtiffly, that neither Union, Orthodox Explications, nor his reverence for ſome of us (when uſeful to him) ſhall ſignify or amount to any thing, if all his Phraſes be not ſtill made uſe of.

Arg. 3. We apprehend this to be their meaning, becauſe in their Explication, there is not a word proper and peculiar to a Commutation in a Legal Senſe, *&c.* What tho' Chriſt dyed in the Perſon of a Mediator, to Anſwer for our violation of the Law of Works, yet if he dyed not in the Perſon of Sinners, to Anſwer for them the violated Law of Works, he did not, he could not, make ſatisfaction to Vindictive, or Remunerative Juſtice.

Anſw. 1. We ſhall not inſiſt how proper ſatisfaction is to Remunerative Juſtice, nor how unfair it is to argue, as if we had ſaid, Chriſt dyed *only* in the Perſon of a Mediator (when our Paper hath no ſuch thing) *only* becauſe himſelf had ſaid, our words are Calculated for the *Meridian* of ſuch who hold ſo.

Anſw. 2. Our own words will convince the unbiaſſed, whether there be ſtrength or truth in this Argument; take what we ſay in the ſecond and third Heads in our Paper, which muſt be Connected to expreſs our Senſe.

'Chriſt our Mediator by agreement with the Father, came into our room and ſtead to Anſwer for our Violation of the Law of Works, he being made ſin for us, that knew no ſin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him; and with Chriſt as ſtanding in our ſtead, God was no otherwiſe diſpleaſed, than as having a will to inflict on him the puniſhment of our ſins which he had undertaken to bear, that God might, without Injury to his Juſtice or Honour, Pardon and Save penitent believers through his ſatisfaction, and interceſſion founded thereon.

Can

Can any read these words, and honestly infer, That we have not a word proper to a Commutation in a Legal Sense, or that we denyed Christs satisfaction, or that Christs satisfaction was impossible by the Account we give thereof? And yet we are charged in the report with each of these: But for the better information of the Reader, we shall shew what our Account containeth.

First, The Father as the offended Rector proposeth, and agrees upon, Terms with Christ our Mediator, upon which Condemned Sinners shall be Pardoned and Saved.

Secondly, The Terms proposed and agreed are such, as sufficiently secure Gods Honour, and make amends to Justice, so that neither are to suffer any injury by Pardoning the Sinner; and they are such as *Answered for all our Violations of the Law of Works, and they are such as render Christs sufferings a punishment for our Sins.*

Thirdly, The Father and Son agree not only that these Terms are sufficient, but that also they shall be Accounted to us, and performed in our *room and stead*, we mean, *vice nostra, & loco nostro*; that therein he was to Answer for our Violations of the Law, and that we should be Pardoned and Saved thereupon.

Fourthly, Upon this agreement the Father as a just Ruler, provoked by us Sinners, doth justly inflict the punishment of our sins on Christ, for *satisfaction to his Justice* (which is the same, as that his Justice might not be injured.)

Fifthly, Christ suffers those punishments in our stead, and is therein a sin-offering for us (tho' not deputed by us) *That we might be made the Righteousness of God in him.*

Sixthly, What he suffered is a *satisfaction*; his intercession is founded upon that satisfaction, for, and by, which the penitent believer is Pardoned and Saved:

If we have not herein affirmed and explained a *Legal Commutation*, and Christs suretyship in a sound sense (tho' not the Reporter's) and affirmed Christs satisfaction, yea, enumerated the essentials of it; we despair that we ever can. And if Men will not Acknowledge, the Reporter doth mis-represent us, and intend his Phrases to be a cover for several Errors, when this Orthodox Sense of them could not satisfy him; we can but bewail their prejudice and partiality.

Answ. 3. We do not see why our words (*Viz.*) Christ dyed in our room and stead (which he leaves out) to Answer for our Violations of the Law of Works, *&c.* Should not make Christs satisfaction possible; yea, and affirm it, as well as their words (*Viz.*) Christ put on the Person of Sinners and came into their room and stead, to Answer for them the Obligations of the violated Law of Works. Putting on the *Person of Sinners*, can have no good sense beyond Christs coming into our room and stead, which we have asserted; the words, *for them*, have but the same import: And seeing the violated Law obliged us to dye, for our Violations of that Law; if Christ in our stead Answered for our Violations of that Law, for which it put us under those Obligations to Dye; then Christ Dyed to Answer for us the obligations of that violated Law, *i. e.* its obligations on us to dye for our sins; to which Christs satisfaction (which is the point in hand) refers.

Answ. 4. From what we observe so oft repeated by the *Reporter*, had he justly represented the Third Paper, and dealt sincerely, he must have reduced all his Reasons and Arguments to prove his heavy charge against us, and to justify the Dissenters refusal of that Paper, to this one Argument, (*Viz.*)

They, who in a Paper expresly affirm and explain the satisfaction of Christ, omitting to mention these words, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*, do pervert, deny and make the satisfaction of Christ impossible.

But

But the Presbyterians (in the Third Paper) expresly affirm and explain the satisfaction of Christ, omitting to mention these words, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*; Therefore the Presbyterians do in the Third Paper, pervert, deny, and make the satisfaction of Christ impossible.

Upon this Argument, the true weight of the Reporters cause and charge doth hang; and if the *Major* be true, the Consequence will be, that all the Churches of Christ in their Confessions pervert and deny, and make impossible the satisfaction of Christ. For to our Remembrance these words, *Christ took on him the Person of Sinners*, are omitted in the Confessions of all the Churches; and we had much more Reason to omit them, when we knew for what End they are insisted on, by such as the Reporter.

Arg. 4. They impose a Sense in expres Contradiction to the Letter, and General Scope of Mr. *Williams*'s Book, that when he saith, 'There is no Change of 'Persons between Christ and the Elect, It could not be in'tended as a denial of a Change of Persons, between 'Christ and us in the General Sense, but only in oppo'sition to his adversary he wrote against; for in that 'very place he expresly affirms, Christ suffered and 'dyed in our room and stead; for his words are as ex'clusive of a Change of Persons in every Sense, as 'words can be, &c. p 37. to 41. *Gospel Truth: first E*'dition.

Answ. 1. Mr. *Williams* no where saith, there is not a Change of Persons in the Plural Number, but of Person Singular; yet the Paper as Subscribed made him to say the first; however, the Report doth change it now, nor is this a small mistake with him, when he takes a *Change of Persons*, to refer thus to intelligent beings, (*Viz.*) Christ dying in the Room of Condemned Sinners, which he affirms: But a *Change of Person* to denote a Change, as to Office, Acts, Qualities, Adjuncts,

&c. Really inſeparable, and peculiar to either Chriſt on the one part, or Men on the other; as is plain by all his Arguments againſt a Change of Perſon, *p.* 41. 'There is no Change of Perſon between Chriſt and the 'Elect, for Chriſt was the *Saviour*; and never ceaſed to 'be ſo; we are the *Saved* and not the *Saviours*, Chriſt 'was the *Redeemer*, we the *Redeemed* and not the *Re-* 'deemers: Chriſt was he who by his *own merits* forgives 'us, but never was *forgiven*; we are *forgiven*, and ne- 'ver had merits of our own to forgive our ſelves, or 'others. It's profane Arrogance for us to pretend 'to his *Prerogatives*, and it's Blaſphemy to debaſe him 'among them who were Enemies without ſtrength 'and ſinners, *for whom he was the dying Sacrifice*; it's 'enough that he reſerving the *peculiars* of a Redeemer, 'ſhould agree to dye for *our ſins*; it is enough that we 'are pardoned for his ſake, when we deſerved endleſs 'woe, and are never capable of making the leaſt 'Attonement.

Here you have all which Mr. *Williams* hath written againſt a Change of Perſon, wherein is not a word againſt Change of Perſons, and it's evident, he took Change of Perſon in the afore-recited Senſe.

Anſw. 2. When he confutes the Senſe wherein Dr. *Criſp* explains a Change of Perſon, he muſt in denying his Senſe, deny it under that Phraſe (Change of Perſon) of which the Dr. gave that Senſe: Take then the Doctors words, 'Chriſt himſelf is not ſo Compleatly 'Righteous, but we are *as Righteous as he*; nor we ſo 'compleatly ſinful, but Chriſt became as *compleatly ſin-* 'ful as we; that very ſinfulneſs that we were Chriſt is 'made, that very ſinfulneſs before God; ſo that here is 'a direct change, Chriſt takes our Perſon and Condi- 'tion, we take Chriſts Perſon and Condition; with much of this ſort, *p.* 38. Here's the Change of Per- ſon which Dr. *Criſp* affirms, this is the change Mr. *Williams* denies.

Anſw.

Answ. 3 Mr. *W.* is so far from denying a change of Persons in the general Sense, that in that Book he oft asserts and proves what the Orthodox intend by that Phrase, yea, in the very places where he denies a change of Person. *See p.* 37. 39. 'Christs sufferings and obedience were *so in our stead*, that God cannot exact from us any other Atonement for Sin, *p.* 42. He thus explains the Imputation of Christs sufferings; to impute to one, what is suffered by another, is to esteem the one *undertaken* for in the sufferings of the other, and to deal with him as if himself had suffered the same things, *p.* 43. Had not Christ suffered *for us*, we could not have been absolved for the sake of his sufferings, *p.* 47. God hath provided for his *Justice and Honour* (in saving true Christians) by the satisfaction of Christ, *p.* 247. The *Punishment* of our Sins, yea, the *Guilt* of them as an obligation to punishment was laid upon Christ our *Sponsor*. *See p.* 79. 13. What words can more distinctly and properly express the Orthodox Sense of a change of Persons?

Answ. 4. His Cavils, *p.* 9. against Mr. *Williams*, as not affirming the Sense of a change of Persons, tho he say, *Christ suffered and dyed in our room and stead*; are weak and individious for,

First, Mr. *Williams* when he had a fit occasion (as the Reporter knows) duely asserts Christs suretyship, and proves; 'That Christ suffered not only for our 'good but in our stead, and that he was a proper 'ἀντίλυτρος, See this at large, *Man made Righteous*, p. 91 *&c.*

Secondly, The *Racovian* Catechism in the *Amsterdam* Edition (and not only *Modern Socinians*) affirm, Christ dyed in our stead; and *Socinus*, *Crellius* and others, asserted a change of Persons between Christ and us, and the Sense in which the first take dying in our stead is as Metaphorical, and Improper, as the last do take a change of Persons in. But if our Reporter finds a Socinian,

nian, to use a Phrase explained in an ill Sense by themselves, and others make use of that Phrase in a contrary Sense never so expressly, his way is presently to charge upon them the use of that Phrase in the *Socinian* Sense; the same dealings towards him were equally just, when he useth the Phrases the *Antinomians* are wont to do.

Thirdly, After all he hath said, to make the stress of our cause against the *Socinians*, to depend upon the Terms, change of Persons, *&c.* An insight into that Controversy would convince him, that there are other things which do far more certainly *define* that Controversy about the satisfaction, (*Viz.*) Was Christ in his Death, an Expiatory Sacrifice? Did he make Atonement to the Justice of God? Did Christ endure the Punishment of our Sins? *&c.* All these Mr. *Williams* in *Gospel Truth* asserts. To what's repeated before out of that Book, we will add, *p.* 7. 'Our sins were 'imputed to Christ with respect to the Guilt thereof, 'so that he by the Fathers appointment and his own 'consent became obliged as Mediator, to bear the Punishment of our Sins, and he did bear those Punishments to the full satisfaction of Justice, and to our 'Actual Remission, when we believe. If he that writes thus must Socinianize, none are free besides the *Antinomians*. But what can be safely said in the Opinion of the Reporter, who tells us, *p.* 10. It was a *Ridiculing* Dr. *Crisp*, when Mr. *Williams* shewing the ground of his mistakes saith, *p.* 52. 'Because Christ 'suffered in our stead, that the Fruit of his sufferings 'might be our deliverance from suffering and our be-'ing saved at last, therefore he thinks there is a 'change of Person: Which very words do evidence plainly, that Mr. *Williams* by, *in our stead*, allows the sound Sense of a change of Persons, while he opposeth Dr. *Crisps* Erroneous Sense of his change of Person; and that Mr. *W.* took a change of Person and a change of Persons in a very different Sense; tho the *Disputer* or *Reporter*, seem

seem not to distinguish between a *Surrogation*, upon which an Innocent expiates anothers Crime, and his becoming the very sinning Criminal; or, to use his own Metaphor with him, He that is a surety to pay the Drunkards Debt, must in Quality, Nature and Condition be the Drunkard too.

Fourthly, Whatever the Reporter saith of the *Scope, or offensiveness of that Book* of Mr. *Williams*'s, called, *Gospel Truth Stated*; Those Brethren whom he calleth *of biggest Name*, who Subscribed the first Paper, have declared they intended not by that Paper to censure the passages against which the Dissenters objected; but were so far from Condemning any Passage therein, that they Subscribed the first Paper, because they were sure, that upon enquiry it would appear, there was nothing in that Book of Mr. *Williams*'s contrary to the Sense of that first Paper; and they still as well as formerly declare, it is an useful Book, and that it's the cause of truth it pleads, and have given it under their hands that the State of Truth and Error is not at all enlarged or changed, since they first Subscribed, nor did they mean so in the first Paper; but only that there were in the Book, besides the *State of Truth and Error*, several Explications and Arguments added thereunto; nor indeed could the State of Truth and Error be enlarged or changed, because (as it is attested by several, even of those sixteen that were the first, who Subscribed to the first Edition) the Book as far as it contained the *State of Truth and Error* was Printed before they Subscribed the Attestation; nor do we know of any of the Subscribers of that Attestation, who do dis-allow the said Book, nor any whose Names are affixed thereto without their consent—We shall conclude with these further remarks.

1. Besides the mis-representation of the points in difference, and of the Account given by us (in the Third Paper) of these Doctrines, *&c.* We could detect great mistakes as to Matters of Fact, Some refused

nian, to use a Phrase explained in an ill Sense by themselves, and others make use of that Phrase in a contrary Sense never so expressly, his way is presently to charge upon them the use of that Phrase in the *Socinian* Sense; the same dealings towards him were equally just, when he useth the Phrases the *Antinomians* are wont to do.

Thirdly, After all he hath said, to make the stress of our cause against the *Socinians*, to depend upon the Terms, change of Persons, *&c.* An insight into that Controversy would convince him, that there are other things which do far more certainly *define* that Controversy about the satisfaction, (*Viz.*) Was Christ in his Death, an Expiatory Sacrifice? Did he make Atonement to the Justice of God? Did Christ endure the Punishment of our Sins? *&c.* All these Mr. *Williams* in *Gospel Truth* asserts. To what's repeated before out of that Book, we will add, *p.* 7. 'Our sins were 'imputed to Christ with respect to the Guilt thereof, 'so that he by the Fathers appointment and his own 'consent became obliged as Mediator, to bear the Punishment of our Sins, and he did bear those Punishments to the full satisfaction of Justice, and to our 'Actual Remission, when we believe. If he that writes thus must Socinianize, none are free besides the *Antinomians*. But what can be safely said in the Opinion of the Reporter, who tells us, *p.* 10. It was a *Ridiculing* Dr. *Crisp*, when Mr. *Williams* shewing the ground of his mistakes saith, *p.* 52. 'Because Christ 'suffered in our stead, that the Fruit of his sufferings 'might be our deliverance from suffering and our being saved at last, therefore he thinks there is a 'change of Person: Which very words do evidence plainly, that Mr. *Williams* by, *in our stead*, allows the sound Sense of a change of Persons, while he opposeth Dr. *Crisps* Erroneous Sense of his change of Person; and that Mr. *W.* took a change of Person and a change of Persons in a very different Sense; tho the *Disputer* or *Reporter*,

seem

seem not to distinguish between a *Surrogation*, upon which an Innocent expiates anothers Crime, and his becoming the very sinning Criminal; or, to use his own Metaphor with him, He that is a surety to pay the Drunkards Debt, must in Quality, Nature and Condition be the Drunkard too.

Fourthly, Whatever the Reporter saith of the *Scope, or offensiveness of that Book* of Mr. *Williams*'s, called, *Gospel Truth Stated*; Those Brethren whom he calleth *of biggest Name*, who Subscribed the first Paper, have declared they intended not by that Paper to censure the passages against which the Dissenters objected; but were so far from Condemning any Passage therein, that they Subscribed the first Paper, because they were sure, that upon enquiry it would appear, there was nothing in that Book of Mr. *Williams*'s contrary to the Sense of that first Paper; and they still as well as formerly declare, it is an useful Book, and that it's the cause of truth it pleads, and have given it under their hands that the State of Truth and Error is not at all enlarged or changed, since they first Subscribed, nor did they mean so in the first Paper; but only that there were in the Book, besides the *State of Truth and Error*, several Explications and Arguments added thereunto; nor indeed could the State of Truth and Error be enlarged or changed, because (as it is attested by several, even of those sixteen that were the first, who Subscribed to the first Edition) the Book as far as it contained the *State of Truth and Error* was Printed before they Subscribed the Attestation; nor do we know of any of the Subscribers of that Attestation, who do dis-allow the said Book, nor any whose Names are affixed thereto without their consent—We shall conclude with these further remarks.

1. Besides the mis-representation of the points in difference, and of the Account given by us (in the Third Paper) of these Doctrines, *&c.* We could detect great mistakes as to Matters of Fact, Some refused

fuſed to Subſcribe the firſt Paper, as Mr. *Slater*; ſome who ſay they never Subſcribed it, as Mr. *Barker*, are yet ſet down as Subſcribers; others are ſaid to expreſs their approbation of it, who vehemently declared their diſallowance of it, as Dr. *Anneſley*, &c. The Reporter ſaith, he cannot Learn, there are five Paſtors of Churches Diſſenting from it, when it's Notorious to Perſons, more retired, that from the firſt about Twenty Paſtors of Churches Aſſented not; yea, we know not one of our Meeting who did Subſcribe it, but were ſoon convinced that an Explication of it was needful, and therefore agreed to the Third Paper. Other miſtakes might be added.

2. It was unjuſt and diſingenuous, for the Reporter to Publiſh this firſt Paper with the Names of our Brethren affixed thereto. They, from a Zeal for Union, condeſcended to prepare a way for it by Subſcribing, but then they declared they Subſcribed not as their concluſive Act, but agreed thereto upon condition the Meeting of the United Miniſters would approve of it, and to whom they did wholly refer it. Yet he publiſheth it as a conſummate Inſtrument (tho the Copy was neve deliver'd as ſuch, and the Original not at all) and this without their conſent, and after he knew they had laid it aſide, and agreed to another Paper as the Inſtrument of Union. Such a courſe muſt Miniſter Jealouſie, that the Reporter when Active in carrying on that Paper; did more deſign a breach among the United, than Union with the Diſſenters, and that his diſappointment produceth this report; when he ſaw our Union among our ſelves Conſolidated of late, and that one of our Articles is to this effect, that we'll ſuffer none commonly called Lay-men, to Preach in our Pulpits.

3. The Reporter hath no reaſon to glory in any of our Brethrens agreement with him in Doctrine, in any point wherein the firſt Paper differs from the third:

by

by which third Paper they ſupply what was wanting, and explain what was doubtfull in the firſt Paper, and determine their ſenſe of thoſe Doctrines: nor did they ever intend the weight of their Aſſertions ſhould be laid upon any unſcriptnrall words, but upon the orthodox ſenſe of them, which our Paper ſtateth.

4. It's matter of grief to us, that in oppoſiition to the preface of both Papers, Law-terms and *humane forms of ſpeech*, in Doctrines ſo fully expreſſed in the Goſpel and capable of being expreſſed in the words uſed and appointed by the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould be made Engines of Diviſion among perſons who agree in the ſenſe of ſuch phraſes, and yet dare not ſay, that God deſigned to limit or extend his Revelations by what ſuch terms may ſignify in humane Laws or Uſages, eſpecially when they need Explications and Limitations to prevent what's groſly erroneous; to inſtance, *Chriſt tookon him the perſon of Sinners*; if it be taken in its extent, it will not only be true, that it was of all Sinners, but that he took upon him *all* that *belonged* to ſinners as ſuch, and he was to be reputed *as* ſinfull as they, yea, as *all* of them: But the Churches of Chriſt have been wiſer than to inſert ſuch phraſes into their Confeſſions, knowing it would confound the Minds and perplex the Conſciences of Chriſtians in points of greateſt concernment to their Salvation.

5. This report gives a pregnant inſtance what *Zeal* for a party will tempt Men to; even to miſrepreſent Perſons and Things, to invent and applaud ſlight pretences againſt Union with their Brethren, break all rules of Decency in praiſing or diſpraiſing men, as their turn is ſerved; raiſe endleſs noiſe and clamours, let the juncture be never ſo unſeaſonable; nay, cover and plead for the errors of their aſſociates, which at other times they themſelves have condemned.

There is occaſion enough to invite our enlargement: but we deſign to irritate no man; the vindication of

our

our ſelves from a printed charge ſo ſevere (as the perverting, denying and making the ſatisfaction of Chriſt impoſſible) is ſo neceſſary, that all Men muſt juſtify our publiſhing this defence: Without a Narrative of matters of fact as to doctrines (for other things we omit) tranſacted with the Brethren who left the Union, our Apology had been dark and imperfect; otherwiſe we had mentioned nothing of that kind. It's this *Reporter* muſt bear the blame, that we are compell'd to ſay ſo much to convince the World, that if the Brethren had ſuch a diſpoſition to Peace, as we have all along expreſſed, the union had never been broken; after they had made a breach we had ſoon re united; and when a re-union was refuſed by them, we yet had lived in quietneſs, and prevented their heats, which have ſtumbled the well-meaning, and advantaged our enemies, by producing ſuch clamorous debates, and unjuſt reflections and miſrepreſentations. We have not to our knowledge omitted any thing conſiſtent with integrity to prevent our breaches, or to heal them. Another ſupplicatory Letter to the Brethren for Union was written in Reply to the diſcouraging Anſwer they had given to our former; being contented to repeat thoſe ſelf-denying Methods, which many would judge hardly meet or prudent. But this Report hath prevented the ſending of this Letter, which was delayed by the time taken up in confirming the Union among our ſelves. In this our Anſwer to the Report, we have for a reunion propoſed to ſubſcribe the very Phraſes they inſiſt on, provided their ſenſe may be duly adjuſted, and thoſe plain Truths ſecured, upon which practicall Godlineſs and a true Goſpel-miniſtry ſo much depend. By which propoſall we hope many of our diſſenting Brethren, who have been impoſed on, will be ſo undeceived, as to reunite with us, and leave ſuch to themſelves who will ſtill divide for the ſake of ſuch errors as theſe Brethren cannot approve, and

there-

therefore will not for the ſtrengthening of their hands be longer contented to bear the imputation of thoſe Opinions, and contribute to the propagation of them; neither of which can be avoided, if they continue to be of a party with thoſe who ſo publickly plead for thoſe errors, and divide from us only for defending the oppoſite Truths. Their own obſervation will furniſh them with many more Arguments at laſt to change their courſe, eſpecially if they'll conſider where it's like to end; it's already come to this paſs, that with a ſtock of theſe errors, their ignorant *Lay-men* ſet up for the only Goſpel-preachers, and are crouded after. Many of their own people are ſo infected as to decry themſelves for Legaliſts, when they dare preach of any thing beſides Believers priveledges, and the Prieſthood of Chriſt; ſuch things cannot but affect all them who mind the intereſt of Chriſt above their own; of which number we are perſwaded many of the Diſſenters be, and will approve themſelves. We conclude unfeignedly praying, that the God of Peace will encreaſe all our Light and Love, that with a truly Chriſtian Spirit we may joyntly ſerve the intereſt of our common Lord.

We ſhall add ſome Reflections on a Paper called, *Remarks, &c.* Which ſoon follow'd the *Report*; and too much reſemble each other. But having already Anſwer'd what's moſt material, few further reflections will ſuffice: And we ſhall ſpeak of the Authors as if but one Man.

Firſt, It was needful to applaud the publiſhing his reported Paper, *as refreſhing to himſelf*, p. 1. Becauſe it's ſo offenſive to all ſerious Perſons; nor ſee we, how even he could be refreſhed thereby, further than as he Glorieth in deceiving the ſimple, loves diviſions, and hath a Proſpect of attaining ſome miſchievous purpoſe by our Breaches.

Secondly, Theſe his Papers, inſtead of *removing*, do Proclaim and fix that reproach upon him and his adherents,

rents, *Viz. That they divide for dividing sake, and know not about what they differ*, p. 6. for he assigneth their Divisions to one or two meer words or Law Terms, as to the Sillables and Letters, and not to the Sense, upon which they will not openly fix their disagreement. But if he would remove this reproach, let him plainly and honestly contend for their Errors which we oppose, and no longer deceive the world by impertinently nibbling at a few expressions, and from thence charging us with Opinions which, he is convinced, all of us abhor. Only he thinks it will be a greater reproach to Acknowledge, they divide for such horrid Errors, than that they divide for dividing sake, and differ about they know not what; Custome and Nature being some excuse for both these.

Thirdly, The confidence of this remarker is more than ordinary, that *p.* 7. 15. can tell the World, *That the Points in Controversy are by his Paper made manifest.* Which, he saith, is about a *Change of Persons.* Whereas this change of Persons never was the whole, nor any part of the Controversy between us. *Nota Bene*, For it is asserted expresly by all of us in the Third Paper, assoon as it was objected to us, and the sound Sense of it affirmed in Mr. *Williams*'s Book long before. Far less was this the whole of the Controversy; for tho' he Accounts the bottom in the first Paper to *be generous*, because our Brethren therein made so little Provision against the *Crispian* Errors, yet we must mind him these Errors gave rise to our differences, and the abettors thereof still refuse to give us satisfaction; yea, even as to the most pernicious of their Opinions.

Fourthly, Sure he is conscious, what we must think of him, when *p.* 7, 8, 9. He heaps so many words to shew that the *Difference among us, concerning a Commutation of Persons, is not about trifles, or matters of lesser weight, but what's essential to Salvation.* He cannot blame us to ask, Is it the *meer phrase*, change of Persons, or the *sound sense*

enſe of that phraſe, which he ſaith is the *Corner-ſtone of Chriſts ſatisfaction*, and what's ſo applauded by *Juſtin Martyr* and Dr. *E. &c.* If it be the meer phraſe, all the Churches of Chriſt are Condemned, becauſe their Confeſſions omit it. If it be the Senſe of the *Reporter* and *Criſpians*, then the Reverend Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, *Grotius*, Dr. *E.* and our Celebrated *Antiſocinian* Authors are in as bad a Caſe as we, for they reject that Senſe. But if it be the ſound Senſe expreſſed by Dr. *Edwards*, as cited in the remarks, which deſerves theſe Praiſes, they cannot be denied to us, no not to Mr. *Williams*; for his Book aſſerts, *Not only that Chriſts Blood was ſhed inſtead of ours, his life went in exchange for ours*, and that to ſatisfy Juſtice and Anſwer the Law; but alſo, *that Chriſts ſufferings were Puniſhments.* Yon'll preſently ſee the Judgment of the Learned Dr. *Edwards*, whom he recites as a favourer of his cauſe againſt Mr. *Williams.*

Fifthly, If the *Congregational Brethren* have no more than *their Signing the Firſt Paper, to clear them from the Charge of Antinomianiſm*, they muſt ſtill abide under that charge. Notwithſtanding all that's ſaid, *p.* 9. 10, 11. the invalidity of his Reaſons will appear by our Anſwer to each. 1. How can their preſent Declaration of their *adhering to their approbation* of the Articles of the *Church* of *England*, or to the Confeſſions of Faith, *&c.* Prove, *They are far from being tainted with Antinomianiſm* ? When ſeveral of them have Publiſhed their *Antinomian* Opinions, both before and ſince the like Declaration. 2. They do ſtill affirm, that neither Repentance nor Faith are neceſſary to a Sinners Pardon, or Juſtification before God; but only follow that; whatever they be to final ſalvation. Nor doth this Paper ſay any thing againſt it. 3. It's palpably falſe, that the firſt Paper affirms, that God doth not Pardon, Juſtify, or accept a Sinner, nor Entitle him to Eternal Life before the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt be applyed

plyed and received by Faith (it's strange he said not before repentance too) but it's not true as to Faith it self. The Paper saith, *The only Righteousness for the sake of which God Pardons, Justifies, or Accepts Sinners, or Intitles them to Eternal Life, is the alone Righteousness of Christ without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.* Note, he puts applyed for imputed (which he would not say is by Faith) and here is not so much, as that it's only the believing Sinner who is justified: But above all, he knows of his Party who explains such words, by publishing, that Christs Righteousness when applyed and received by Faith, is only for a manifestation to their Consciences for their quiet, that Christs Righteousness had been applyed to the Justification of their Persons before God, long before they believed. This is all the Justification by Christs Righteousness as received by Faith; but they were Pardoned and Entituled to Life as much before, tho' they knew it not. And this Opinion the Paper denies not. 4. The Paper saith, *Christ came into the Room of Sinners not to repent, or believe for them, which the Gospel requires.* The remarker knew, if the Gospel requires these by its Precepts, it was a slip overlook'd by such of them who deny the Gospel to be a Law, therefore he wordeth it, *The elect are not exempt from an obligation of doing it themselves.* But he as well knows they hold, there's no obligation on them to repent or believe as a condition or Term of obtaining any benefit purchased by Christ; as to that, they have nothing to do. Also that it was the Law of Works, and that only, which commandeth Faith and Repentance with any Sanction; And the Paper contradicteth them not. 5. Tho the Paper saith, there is not such a Moral change whereby Christ became *Inherently* sinful, and we immediately sinless, yet they do and may still hold, that the filth, fault and fact of sin are so Transacted on Christ, that he was in Gods Account a very Criminal, the Blasphemer, &c.

And

And that we are as Righteous as Christ in equality. And the *Legal Sense* of the Change is such, that we are legally reputed to have made satisfaction our selves by obeying and dying; because Christ did it in our Persons, and we did it in his Person. 6. The Paper saith, the Father was not offended, much less abhorred Christ, considered as he was in himself, But as in Relation to us as our surety; and the Father was displeased with Christ, as the guilt of our Iniquities was laid upon him. And he knows his Friends do hold, that God was displeased with and abhorred Christ, because of the fault and filth of sin upon him as our surety; which the Paper at least forbids not. It's worth observing, that this Article was framed in opposition to one of the two only Errors objected here against Mr. *Williams*'s Book: Whose words are these: 'That God testified 'his threatned indignation against sin, in the awful 'sufferings of Christ in his Soul and Body, &c. (And 'that Christ endured the effects of Gods wrath) yet the 'Father was not displeased with Christ, much less abhorred him because of the filthiness of sin upon him, *p.* 31, 32. Here's the Error (and but once mentioned) that required one of the three Articles to oppose it. Our Third Paper hath given them far more ground to make this the point in Controversy, than that of Change of Persons (which it asserts both as to Name and Sense.) But they insist not on this, because of the odious sound of what they must assert in opposition to it. As to the Remarkers hint from the Assemblies words, that Christ endured the weight of Gods wrath; Let us mind him, that displicency is opposed to Complacential Love, and therefore none can be the object of Gods displeasure, but one who is evil and wicked in the sight of the Lord, and therefore hateful to him as such. But the effects of Gods Rectoral wrath may fall on Christ, tho beloved as our surety, yea, who was not hated but loved for dying, according to his own Voluntary

luntary Engagements. Review these things, and judge what a poor Vindication from *Antinomianism* the first Paper affordeth. Unless they think, he must be far enough from this Error, that obeyeth the Law of Works to be in full force, and the only Law, altho they also hold, that the elect have fulfilled this Law perfectly in Christ, and therefore are themselves to yield no sort of obedience in order to any benefit, or preventing of any punishment. Here's all the Zeal for the Law which they think enough to acquit them from *Antinomians*, and all who think that we under the Gospel are any further obliged, are to be *Neonomians*. But. 7. Yet as great a Liberty as this Paper gives *Antinomians* to subscribe it; observe in what a faint and dark manner they do subscribe even this poor defence; their words are; *We are glad to find so good an agreement among us as this Paper doth express.* This is all. But wherein? or how far? Or under what Limitations? Or in hopes of what future advances this agreement is to be construed? They have reserved sufficient liberty to explain as occasion offers; and cannot deny the reader a leave to guess, especially when he seeth the Reporter already to differ so very much from our Brethren, in his explication of a Change of Persons, and other things contained in that Paper. 8. But yet further, as poor a defence against *Antinomianism* as the Paper is, if plainly assented to; And as meer a nullity as the Subscription is, there were several of the Congregational who refused to do even thus much; and refused to set their hands to this. Which the Reporter well knows, whatever Art he hath used to hear what they all have done.

May not we hope upon so plain evidence. That such of our Congregational Brethren as are not *Antinomians*, will be convinced, it's necessary to do yet more for their Vindication than thus signing this Paper; seeing that, not only they, *who are far from being tainted with*

this

this Poiſon, but they who are moſt infected may ſafely Subſcribe as it requires, and they have done, who in the adjuſting of this Paper could not be brought to grant, that Regeneration is neceſſary to bring us into a good State.

6. Notwithſtanding his Complement to a few Subſcribers, *p.* 12, 13, 15. *The Presbyterians need not ſubſcribe the firſt Paper to acquit them from the Socinian ſlander, that they are Arminians*: No, nor yet from the Reporters ſlander, that they are *Socinians*.

They have done it more effectually in the publiſhed *agreement in Doctrine*, 1692. They have done it yet more in the *Articles* 1694. Which had been alſo publiſhed, if theſe Diſſenters could have cleared themſelves of *Antinomianiſm*, as the *Presbyterians* did of *Arminianiſm*. Yea, they have done it as fully by the *Third Paper* as can be by the *Firſt*: That retains the ſame words in the Head of Juſtification, and in all the reſt, as far as they oppoſe *Arminianiſm*. Nay, do not we and Mr. *Williams* Book, aſſert Chriſts ſufferings to be a puniſhment in ſatisfaction to punitive Juſtice? which the remarker, *p.* 14. 15. declares to be the diſtinguiſhing point; are not our words, *Chriſt came into our room and ſtead to dye, to anſwer for our violations of the Law of Works, and that the puniſhment of our ſins were inflicted on Chriſt, that God might without injury to his Juſtice or Honour, Pardon Sinners for his ſatisfaction*? What a ſlanderous Spirit Acteth this Man, that makes Chriſts ſatisfaction to punitive Juſtice, to be that which diſtinguiſheth the *Arminians* and *Socinians* from the Orthodox? And yet ranketh us among the former, tho he knows all of us aſſented to the Third Paper, which affirmeth Chriſts ſufferings were a ſatisfaction to punitive Juſtice.

7. But *how long* will this Man acquit any of the *Presbyterians*, from the ſlander of being *Arminians* and *Socinians* too? He is ſure, the World will ſoon know that even they of our Brethren, who Subſcribed the *firſt*

Paper, have several of them framed, and the others assented to the *Third Paper*, as an Explication of their Sense of the *first*. The Reporter saith, the *Third Paper* perverts and denies the satisfaction of Christ, in the Account given of a Change of Persons; If so, he must Account these Brethren hereafter no other than *Arminians* and *Socinians* in common with the rest of us; perhaps he'll Proclaim them Apostates too, for not adhering to the *First Paper*, in opposition to the *Third*. And he is too well known for us to doubt that when it serves his turn, no *Presbyterian* shall be found in the Faith, because he is not a *Crispian* in Doctrine.

8. All his artifice, *p.* 15, 16. hath not, nor ever can reduce the controversy among us into a narrower Room than this. Is Repentance required by the Gospel, in order to the Forgiveness of Sin? and Faith in Christ in order to the Justification of our Persons before God. Unless he'll reduce it to this, Is any Duty on Mans part required by the Gospel in order to his obtaining any saving benefit, or any kind of sin, a bar to his Title to any such benefits by the Gospel constitution? here's the Controversy, and the *Third Paper* is refused because it is express, for the affirmative beyond the first.

9. We are sorry we have so much Reason to fear, that if this pretended point of a Change of Persons, were Accommodated to the *Crispians* liking, Mr. *Lob* would find some occasion to continue our heats and divisions, wherein he had the greatest Hand under the Name of a *Pacificator*, as soon as other Agents became a little quiet. What design he proposeth, or some others by him, if detrimental to the Common Good, we hope, God will disappoint it, and at last favour such who may be repairers of our breach, and restorers of Paths to dwell in.

Reader, Note that our Answer comes out so late, because the Reporter Published his Paper, when he knew our Meetings were laid down, and that we were not to come together till *September*. The

The Report and Answer make mention of a *second Paper*, which to render the whole matter more plain, is here annexed, with the Occasion of it.

Septemb. 7. 1696. At a meeting of the United Ministers, Mr. *Williams* spake to this effect: " Mr. Moderator, I hear by some persons, that since our recess, " there is a disposition in some of the Congregational " Brethren to Peace, if not to Re-union: And that " the only pretended obstacle is the want of satisfaction concerning the Orthodoxness of all of us in the " Points of *Justification*, *Commutation of Persons*, *and* " *the Father's displeasure with Christ*. For their dissatisfaction, they instance somewhat out of my Book as " a denial of a Commutation of Persons, and insinuate " as if the other two were not duly asserted. All " proposals for Re-union should begin with this " Board, nor ought particular Members conclude themselves in a matter of this kind till you are consulted. " But though, I confess, I know not what can be justly " offered, which we have not done already, and all " that concerns my Book is long since adjusted; " yet that nothing may seem wanting on our part to " promote Peace, I would not lose the advantage of " their present inclination to it. And being that only " my Book is objected against, I have drawn up in this " Paper the Heads of a Proposal, to be sent to *P. Hall*, " which I submit to the Judgment of this Board.

That called the Second Paper.

The *Preface* is made up of what's Cited *p.* 4. out of the Agreement 1692; and what is in the Preface of the *first* and *third* Papers. The Three Doctrinals are in these words. We declare,

1. *Of Justification*, As the Gospel plainly requireth Repentance towards God in order to a Sinner's partaking of the Remission of sins, and Faith in our Lord Jesus in order to Justification, and a godly Conversation in order to eternal Glory, promising Justi-

fication and Forgiveneſs of Sin to all penitent Believers, and eternal Life to ſuch as perſevere in Faith and true Holineſs; Alſo declaring all impenitent Unbelievers (while ſuch) to be in a ſtate of Condemnation. So by the ſame Goſpel it is evident, that none of theſe, nor any work done by Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, are under any denomination any part of the Righteouſneſs, for the ſake, or on the account whereof any Bleſſing is merited or procured, much leſs Juſtification or Eternal life. But God juſtifies, pardons, accepts and entitles Sinners to Eternal life only for the ſake of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.

2. *Of Commutation of Perſons.* Whereas ſinners were obnoxious to ſuffer the Puniſhments threatned by the Law for their Tranſgreſſions; The Lord Jeſus by his Compact with the Father, became our mediating Surety; and as ſuch, he obeyed the Law, and our Puniſhments were judicially transferred on him; which for our Redemption he endured in our room and ſtead, to the ſatisfaction of Juſtice, that we might be juſtified when we believe, and be dealt with accordingly. Nevertheleſs we deny that by a Commutation of Perſons there is ſuch a *reciprocal change of condition* betwixt Chriſt and Sinners, or ſuch an imputation, or tranſlation of qualities, as implies that Chriſt was as Sinfull as we, and we as Righteous as Chriſt. And though we aſſert that Chriſt hath undertaken the Elect ſhall in due time repent and believe, yet we deny that Chriſt came into the room of the Elect to repent or believe for them, or that Believers are accounted to have done and ſuffered what Chriſt did, or that they are juſtified by the Law of Works — See more in the next Head.

3. *Of the Fathers being diſpleaſed with Chriſt*; (Though the Phraſe be not proper, yet we declare) The Lord Jeſus having engaged in the Covenant of Redemption, as our mediating Surety, to ſuffer the puniſhment of

our

our Sins for the expiating thereof: He did bear the guilt of our Iniquities, to suffer as Sinners suffer, and to be dealt with as God threatned to deal with them whom he is displeased with, as far as was consistent with Christ's being innocent, and one who became subject to those Punishments by his own consent in Obedience to the Father, and for the Redemption of Sinners. And therefore Christ was under the wrath of God, as that was his will to punish him; yea he endured the weight of that wrath in the punishment of our Sins; which sins, as to the obligation to endure those punishments, were laid on Christ; *It pleased the Lord to bruise him, having laid on him the iniquities of us all.*

But we deny that our Sins, as to their *filth* or *fault*, were transferr'd on Christ, or that he was inherently, or in legal esteem, or looked on by the Father as one contrary to his holy Nature and Will, either as he was our Surety, or in any other respect. And therefore if by *displeased with Christ*, is meant, that the Father *hated* or *abhorred Christ* (which is proper only to one evil in the sight of the Lord) because of our sins imputed to him; So the Father was not displeased with Christ. But on the contrary, the Father was always well-pleased with him, at all times accounting him (even as our High Priest) *holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from Sinners*; and therefore such, when he offer'd himself an expiating Sacrifice; yea, for that he loved him.

Then follows Mr. *William*'s Concurrence in these three Points, with Citations at large out of his Book that he had oft affirmed the very same, and that the places objected did not at all contradict any of these things.

And then further declareth, that as he had oft proposed it, so now he is willing to an Union with the dissenting Brethren, either by mutual forbearance, wherein we differ in judgment; or if satisfaction be

insisted on as to any other expressions that have been or shall be objected out of any of his Books (where he knows nothing but what is orthodox) he is willing to give it in the same time and manner as Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Trayl*, &c shall be obliged to give satisfaction as to many material exceptions he hath made, and shall yet make, to what they have published in their Books. But otherwise he will no farther concern himself, but keep to the Vote past, *Sept.* 16. 1695. notwithstanding that now for Peace-sake, he hath waved the demand thereof in Answering the above mentioned Exceptions, when they are not required to do the like.

Lastly, There is the form of Words for the Subscribers of Mr. *Williams*'s Book which you have before, *p.* 4. cited out of the Agreement 1692: only with this Addition, That Mr. *W.* did not write his Book, nor they subscribe the Approbation with any design to oppose our Congregational Brethren as such, or to divide from them.

This Paper was read and received; but Mr. *W.* desired it might be waved, when a proposal was made by a Subscriber of the *first Paper*, that we should draw up the *third Paper* out of this and another Paper, called the *first*; which were both voted to be laid aside, altho that called the *first Paper* was never read in the Meeting, nor once proposed to be received there.

A LETTER *from the Right Reverend Dr.* Stillingfleet, *Bishop of* Worcester, *in Answer to one from Mr.* Williams, *who desired his Judgment as to the following Questions; because his Lordship's Book is in the first Paper, and the Report pleaded against Mr.* Williams.

SIR,

I Return you Thanks for the Papers you were pleased to send me; by which I am able to Understand something more than formerly, of the Present state of the Difference about *the Change of Persons between Christ and us*: But I shall meddle no farther in it than I am Obliged to do it in Answer to the Questions you propose to me. And I wish I may be able to do any service therein.

The first is about *my sense of Commutation of Persons.* It is said in the first Paper, *that I do with* Grotius *expressly affirm and irrefragably prove it with the common sentiment of Protestants, and that the Doctrines of Justification and Christs satisfaction, cannot be duely Explained and Defended consistently with the Denial of any Commutation of Persons between Christ and Believers.*

This had been fairly Represented, in Case there could be no other sense of *Commutation of Persons* than what is asserted by *Dr. Crisp*, but there is a 3 fold sense of it, very different from each other.

1. Such a Change of Persons as implies that One is Appointed and allowed to Act on behalf of others, and for their Advantage; and this sort of Commutation of Persons the *Socinians* never denied; as I have shewed in the Discourse of *Satisfaction*. p. 62. 190. 191. It is not therefore the Use of the Words, but the sense of them is to been enquired into. For some may Affirm a Change of Persons, and yet be *Socinians*; and others may deny a Change, and be far enough from *Socinianism*, according

according to the ſence in which they are underſtood.

2. Such a Change of Perſons as ſuppoſes One to be ſubſtituted in the Place of others to become an Attonement for them in order to their Redemption and Deliverance. And when ſuch a ſubſtitution is by the Will of God and Conſent of the Perſon who ſuffers; here is a Real Change of Perſons as to that Particular End with is deſigned by it. And in this ſenſe I did Aſſert a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, becauſe by the will of the Father and his own Conſent, he became a Sacrifice of Propitiation for our Sins in order to their Remiſſion, and our Recontiliation with God on ſuch Terms as are declared in the Goſpel; as may be ſeen at large in the Diſcourſe already mentioned, particularly *ch.* 4. § 4

3. Such a Change of Perſons as implies an Actual Tranſlation of the Perſonal guilt of all the Sins of Believers on Chriſt, and his Perſonal Righteouſneſs on them, without Regard to any Conditions on their Part, but meerly by the free Grace and favour of God. And this I take to be *Dr. Criſp's* ſence of the Change of Perſons; of which I ſhall diſcourſe when I come to the laſt Queſtion.

But the Authors of *the firſt Paper* and of *the Report*, p. 4. ſeem to take it for granted that there can be but One Senſe of Commutation of Perſons; wherein they do not diſcover their profound Knowledge in theſe Matters, if they thought ſo; or their Ingenuity, if they knew otherwiſe, and deſigned to impoſe upon thoſe who did not. For it appears that there is a Senſe in which it may and ought to be denied, without the leaſt Prejudice to the Doctrine of Chriſt's ſatisfaction. Although that *cannot be Explained or Defended without* ſome kind of *Commutation of Perſons*; yet it very well may and ought to be Defended without and againſt *Dr. Criſps* ſenſe of it, as will be made appear afterwards.

The

The Author of the *Report*, p. 5. ſaith, *this is the very Hinge on which the Controverſy between the Orthodox and Socinian doth turn*; which ſhews him to be not very deeply skilled in it; for *the Hinge of the Controverſy* is not about the Words, but the ſenſe of *Commutation of Perſons*: and even the ſenſe is not the Original Controverſy, but Conſequential, upon our Aſſerting Chriſts Sacrifice to be a Propitiation for our Sins; for upon this they ask how the Act of one Perſon can be ſo Benificial to others? and to that we Anſwer, that altho One Man's Act cannot become anothers, yet if by Conſent both of the Father and Son, he becomes our Mediatour, and ſuffers in our ſtead, in order to our Reconciliation, then as to that End and Purpoſe, here is *a Change of Perſons*: for whereas in ſtrictneſs we ought to have ſuffered the Deſert of our own Sins, God was pleaſed to Accept of his ſuffering inſtead of ours, and ſo by virtue of that Propitiation we hope for the Remiſſion of Sins and the Favour of God, according to the Terms of the Goſpel. And therein conſiſts the true Controverſy between the *Socinians* and us: *viz.* whether the ſufferings of Chriſt were to be Conſidered as a Puniſhment for our Sins, and as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God for them; or only as an Act of Dominion over an Innocent Perſon in order to his Advancement to glory.

But it is ſaid in the *Report*, p. 5. *that if there be no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, there can be no Tranſlation of the Guilt, nor a juſt infliction of the Puniſhment of our Sins on Chriſt; that is, there can be no proper Satisfaction.*

To this I anſwer, that there is a twofold Tranſlation of Guilt to be Conſidered.

1. Of the Perſonal Guilt, which Reſults from the Acts of ſin committed by ſuch Perſons. If this guilt be tranſlated, Chriſt muſt become the very Perſon who committed the ſins; and ſo he muſt be looked on not only as an Actual Sinner, but as the Perſon that Committed

mitted all the Sins of those for whom he died: which comes so near to horrid Blasphemy, that I wonder Persons that bear any Reverence to our Blessed Saviour do not abhorr the very thoughts of it.

2. Of *Legal Guilt*, which lies in the Obligation to Punishment, by virtue of the Sanction of the Divine Law. Now this Guilt implies two things;

1. The Desert of Punishment which follows Personnal guilt, and cannot be transferred by a Change of Persons; For no man can cease to deserve Punishment for his own faults; nor deserve that another should be punished for them.

2. The Obligation to undergo the deserved Punishment, but because the Execution of Punishment depends both on the Wisdom and Justice of the Legislatour; therefore here a Change of Persons may intervene, and by the wisdom and Justice of God a Mediatour may be Accepted in such a Manner as himself determines, and upon the Acceptante of his Sacrifice the Offenders may be Pardon'd and Received into the Grace and Favour of God, on such Terms as he hath declared in the Gospel. And in this sense the guilt of our Sins was charged upon Christ as our Mediatour, who was to bear the Punishment of our sins; so as by virtue of his sufferings, we may not only hope to escape the Just Punishment of our Offences, but to be Admitted into the Privileges of the Children of God.

But the *Reporter* out of a certain *Manuscript* gives another Account of *Commutation of Persons*, viz. *that Commutation in a legal sense is the same with a proper surrogation, where the surety puts on the Person, and stands in the Quality, state and condition of the Debtor, and lies under the same Obligation to answer for him.*

But this I have shewed long since to be a very wrong Notion of Christs Satisfaction; and which in Effect gives up the Cause to the *Socinians*: For if sins be considered as Debts, God may freely forgive them (without

out disparagement to his Wisdom and Justice) without any Satisfaction: and the Right of Punishment then depends on God's Absolute Dominion; and Satisfaction must be by way of Compensation; of whiah I have treated at large, Ch. 1. §. 2, ul. But I cannot but wonder at the learned Author of the *M. S.* that he doth at the same time assert our sins to be considered *as Debts*, and the *Necessity of Vindictive Justice*: For, what *vindictive justice* belongs to a *Creditor*? May not a *Creditor* part with his own Right, and forgive what and whom he pleases, without any violation of Justice? I can hardly think, that those who write so rudely and inconsistently, ever penetrated into these Matters in their own thoughts; but only take up with a sett of Phrases and Common Expressions among those they Converse with, which they look on as the standard and Measure of Truth about these Matters.

But he finds fault with some men *who hold that Christ only suffered in the Person of a Mediatour, and not in the Person of Sinners.* What is the Meaning of this? I had thought, that a Mediatour interposing for that end, that by his sufferings there might be a Propitiation for sins, did so far *sustain the Person of Sinners*, as to take upon himself the Punishment of their sins, and Procure Grace and Favour for them. But if he means any thing beyond this, he must Explain himself. *Christ suffered in the Person of Sinners.* Is it that he suffered that others might not suffer? That is not denied by those who *say that Christ suffered in the Person of a Mediatour.* For a Mediatour is a Publick Person, and Acts in the stead and on the behalf of others; and if this be called *sustaining the Person of Sinners*, I suppose they will not quarrel with the Expression. But if more be meant by it, *viz.* that the Personal Guilt of sinners, in *Dr. Crisp's* sense, is transferred upon Christ, that they have to deny; as I hope to make it appear in Answer to the third Question.

The

The 2d Queſtion is, *whether the Author of Goſpel Truth ſtated*, viz. Mr. Williams *be chargeable with Socinianiſm*, in *what he ſaid*, p. 37. 40?

The charge ſtands thus in the Report, p. 4. *that he ſaith, there is no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Sinners:* which is there ſaid to be *inconſiſtent with the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction; which muſt ſuppoſe a Commutation of Perſons. And therefore he that denies any Change, cannot aſſert the Doctrine of Satisfaction.*

This is the force of the Objection. And being deſired to give my Opinion of it, I examin'd and compared ſeveral paſſages in that Book, that I might judge truely and impartially concerning it. And I found the Author, p. 3. ſaying concerning the Difference with *Dr. Criſp, that it was not whether Chriſt had made full Attonement for ſin*; which he thereby owned to be his ſenſe. And p. 7. more fully he owns *that our ſins were imputed to Chriſt with Reſpect to the Guilt thereof, ſo that he by the Fathers appointment, and his own Conſent, became obliged as Mediatour to bear the Puniſhments to the full ſatisfaction of Juſtice and to our actual Remiſſion when we believe.* Can any thing be more clear and expreſs againſt Socinianiſm than this? There are other paſſages, p. 10. 19. 28. &c. to the ſame purpoſe, but theſe are ſufficient to ſhew, that he could not abſolutely deny any Commutation of Perſons.

But in what Words doth he deny it? For it is poſſible there may be ſuch Words uſed as may Reſtrain and limit the ſenſe; and then it is very hard to force ſuch a ſenſe upon them, as is inconſiſtent with what he had ſaid before, for no man Loves to Contradict himſelf; eſpecially, when he knows what advantage will be taken by it. The words are theſe, p. 40 *The difference lies in theſe points. 1. Whether there be a change of Perſon between Chriſt and the Elect? Yea, or betwixt Chriſt and Believers. This the Doctor affirms, and I deny.* How can any Perſons, in common Ingennity, underſtand

derſtand this otherwiſe, than that he denied ſuch Change of Perſons as Dr. *Criſp* affirmed? But againſt this it is urged by the Author of the MS. in the *Report*, p. 81. *that his Denial of a Change of Perſons, is ſo Expreſs and full, as leaves no room for any diſtinction, limitation or Reſtriction, or for an owning it in any ſenſe.* What! not in the ſenſe that himſelf had owned it in before? This is very hard; eſpecially when he mentions *what the Doctor affirmed and he denied.* There is a very good paſſage to this purpoſe in the firſt Paper, mentioned in the Report, p. 12. *Not thinking it Reaſonable or juſt to charge upon any Brother ſuch Conſequences of any Expreſſion or Opinion of his, which he himſelf ſhall diſown.* Why then ſhould ſuch a ſenſe be charged upon him, which he diſowns at the ſame time? There muſt be ſomething farther in this Matter, than appears to an Indifferent and Impartial Reader; what it is, is no Part of my buſineſs to enquire.

But that which muſt give the beſt Light into it, will be the Reſolution of the laſt Queſtion.

The *3d Queſtion* is, concerning Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe of the *Change of Perſons*, whether it be true or falſe? Which, I ſuppoſe, is truly ſet down by the Author of *the Goſpel-Truth ſtated*; in theſe words, *p.* 38. *Mark it well, Chriſt himſelf is not ſo compleatly righteous, but we are as righteous as he; nor we ſo compleatly ſinful, but Chriſt became, being made ſin, as ſinful as we; Nay, more, we are the ſame righteouſneſs; for we are made the righteouſneſs of God; that very ſinfulneſs that we were, Chriſt is made that very ſinfulneſs before God. So that here is a direct Change, Chriſt takes our Perſon and Condition, and ſtands in our ſtead, and we take Chriſt's Perſon, and ſtand in his ſtead.*

Here is indeed *a Change of Perſons* ſuppoſed, but I do not find it proved; and therefore is only to be look'd on as an *Imaginary Change*, which it is poſſible for Men to fancy; but that is no Ground to build a

Matter

Matter of Faith upon; and ſuch as the Salvation of their Souls is ſo nearly concerned in. But to deliver my Opinion freely and diſtinctly about it, I ſhall ſhew,

1. That it hath no Foundation in Scripture.

2. That it is contrary to the Tenour of it, and the Terms of Salvation contained in the Goſpel.

3. That it is attended with very bad Conſequences, which naturally follow from it.

1. That it hath no Foundation in Scripture For which I deſire it may be conſidered, that our bleſſed Saviour himſelf in all his Preaching, who came to Reveal the Will of God to Mankind, ſaith nothing at all of it: and can any poſſibly think that he would omit ſuch a Point, wherein, I perceive, ſome do think *the Subſtance of the Goſpel* is contained? All that our Saviour ſaith to this purpoſe, is, *That he came to give his Life a Ranſom for many*, Mat. 20. 28. and that *his Blood was ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of ſins*, Mat. 26. 28. What other *Change of Perſons* is herein implied, but that of *a Ranſom*, and *a Sacrifice of Propitiation*? He that knew beſt for what End he ſuffered, ſaith not one word of his taking upon himſelf the *Perſon of ſinners*, in any other ſenſe than as he ſuffered in their ſtead, and for their advantage. Here is nothing like *his being as compleatly ſinful as we; and our being made as righteous as he.* And yet certainly he communicated to his Diſciples thoſe Points on which their Juſtification and Salvation depended. But how could they apprehend any ſuch *Change of Perſons* in this ſenſe, from any words uſed by himſelf to them? And all neceſſary Points of Faith were deliver'd by our Saviour to his Diſciples: And therefore to make ſuch a Change of Perſons neceſſary, and yet not mention'd by him, is to charge him with failing in his Prophetical Office, which all thoſe ought to conſider, who lay ſuch ſtreſs upon this Matter.

But doth not St. *Paul* ſay, *that God hath made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him*? 2 Cor. 5. 21. I grant he doth ſo. *But do not theſe words imply ſuch a Change of Perſons as Dr.* Criſp *aſſerts*? By no means, Which I thus prove: Dr. *Criſp*'s Notion of *the Change of Perſons*, ſuppoſes the Benefits of this Change to be antecedent to any Conditions on our ſide, *viz.* that it was by a Tranſaction between the Father and the Son, without Regard to any Act of ours: But when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Chriſt's being made ſin for us, and our being made the righteouſneſs of God in him*; he ſuppoſes, that before we can have the Benefit of it, we muſt be firſt *Reconciled to God*, which is an Act on our Part. For to this purpoſe he ſaith, *v.* 18, 19. that after *the Reconciliation* made by Chriſt at his Death, he had given to the Apoſtles *the Miniſtry of Reconciliation*. To what purpoſe? Was it only to let them know what Chriſt had already done for Mankind? That were to ſet up a *Miniſtry of Conſolation* for *Believers*; but not of *Reconciliation*. But the Apoſtle lays great force upon it, *that God had committed to them the Word of Reconciliation. Now then*, ſaith he, *we are Ambaſſadors for Chriſt, as though God did beſeech you by us, we pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye reconciled to God*, v. 20. They were by this *Miniſtry of Reconciliation*, after what Chriſt had done and ſuffered, *prayed*; and with great earneſtneſs, *to be Reconciled to God*? To what End? If according to *this Change of Perſons*, they were *more than Reconciled to God already*, if they were true Believers; for they were *as righteous as Chriſt himſelf*, and therefore muſt be in the Grace and Favour of God. If they were not Believers, then, according to this Scheme of the *Change of Perſons*, they could have no Benefit by it; and conſequently, *this Miniſtry of Reconciliation*, is wholly ſubverted, as to the great Purpoſe and Deſign of it. For either they were *Reconciled*

oiled already, or they never could be. And yet the Apoſtle, after thoſe words, *v.* 21. immediately ſubjoyns *Ch.* 6. 1. *We then as Workers together with him, beſeech you alſo, that ye receive not the Grace of God in vain.* What can the meaning of theſe Words be, if Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe of the *Change of Perſons* hold good? Can they who are *compleatly righteous*, ever *receive the Grace of God in vain*? And to what purpoſe doth he ſpeak of *their working together with God*, and *beſeeching them* not to do a thiug utterly impoſſible? For it would be to undo what had long ſince been done between the Father and the Son in the *Change of Perſons*. So that this Notion of the *Change of Perſons* is as different from St. *Pauls*, as may be; for that ſuppoſes no conditions on our ſide; and the *Miniſtry of Reconciliation in* St. Paul, is wholly founded upon it, and really ſignifies nothing, as to the Ends he propoſes without it. For to what purpoſe is that appointed to perſwade Men to be *Reconciled to God*, if all that ever ſhall be admitted to Heaven were long ſince Reconciled at the Death of Chriſt, and they were made as *compleatly Righteous as Chriſt himſelf*?

It may be ſaid, *That the Miniſtry of Reconciliation is not uſeleſs, becauſe it is the means whereby God doth effectually convey his Grace into the Hearts of Believers.* But this cannot ſatisfy any one that conſiders St. *Pauls* Expreſſions: For his Words are, *We pray you in Chriſts ſtead, be ye Reconciled to God.* If he had ſaid, *That God had made Chriſt to be ſin for you already, and you as Righteous as Chriſt was*; How would it have looked to have ſaid after this, *We pray you to be Reconciled to God*? For, what need they any *Reconciliation*, who were already ſo much in his favour?

But is there nō Change of Perſons then implied in thoſe Words of St. Paul; *Who made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*? Yes certainly. Such a *Change*, whereby Chriſt did

did undergo *the Punishments of our sins*; and so *Erasmus* observes, *that Christ is not called a sinner here*, as Dr. *Crisp* would have it, but *sin*; i. e. *a Sacrifice for sin, according to the Scripture sense: And we are made the Righteousness of God in him*, i. e. That God upon the Account of his Sacrifice, and our Reconciliation to him, would treat us as Righteous Persons; or receive us into his Grace and Favour; which is all that I can find that St. *Paul* understood by this Expression.

2. I am now to shew, that this Notion of the *Change of Persons*, which Dr. *Crisp* asserts, is contrary to the whole Tenour of the Scripture, and the Terms of Salvation contained in the Gospel. I am sensible how large a Field I am enter'd upon: And if I should pursue this matter as it deserves, it would take up much more room than I can allow to this Answer. I could easily prove that in all the Transactions between God and Mankind, some Conditions on our side were required in order to his Favour. So it was in the State of Innocency; So it continued after Mans Fall, as appears by those Remarkable Words of God to *Cain*; *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the Door*, Gen. 4. 7. So it was in Gods dealing with the *Patriarchs*, and the most excellent Persons in the Old Testament, *Abraham*, *Moses*, *David*, *Job*, &c. But I pass over these, (altho' I suppose they will not be denied to have been of the *Elect*, and to have had the Benefit of *Christs Righteousness* as well as Christians) and come to the Terms of Salvation, as declared by Christ himself. Let any one seriously peruse the Doctrine which he Preached from the time, *when he began to Preach and to say, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand*, Mat. 4. 17. And he shall find the main business of his Preaching was to put Men upon performing such Conditions, as were necessary to their Salvation: And for that Reason. As may be seen in his Sermon on the Mount, in which he

begins with promising Blessedness to the *Humble*, *Merciful*, *Pure in Heart*, Mat. 5. 3, 4. *&c.* What do these things mean, if they be not Conditions on our Parts necessary in order to Happiness? And that they are considered by God as such? Why doth he say, *Except your Righteousness exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no Case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 5. if such a Righteousness, be not a Condition required in order to such Entrance? And if it be, no *Change of Persons* without inward and real Righteousness can be sufficient. Our Saviour doth not speak of what will be *Eventually* in some Persons, but of what is required to be done in order to an End. And therefore he concludes his Sermon with saying, *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doth them, I will liken him to a wise Man, who built his House upon a Rock, &c.* Mat. 7. 24. Not he that believes that he is one of those who is made *Compleatly Righteous by a Change of* Persons, without any Change of Temper or Disposition of Mind: He never promises the least Degree of Happiness to such; but still insists on our own Endeavours, *By striving to enter in at the straight Gate, which St.* Paul *Calls, working out our own Salvation with Fear and Trembling, and* St. Peter, *giving all Diligence to make our Calling and Election sure. For*, saith he, *If ye do these things ye shall never Fall.*

Do not these Expressions Note the necessity of the Performance of Conditions on our side? And therefore all Imaginary Notions of such a *Change of Persons*, as hath no Regard to any Acts of ours, is wholly Repugnant to the main Scope and Design of the Gospel. I meddle not with the dispute about the Moral Law, which must continue to oblige us as long as the Reason of it continues; but the main Argument to me is from the Gospel, as it is delivered by Christ and his Apostles, who certainly understood the *Substance and Design* of it far better than Dr. *Crisp*, or the *Reporter* doth.

doth. What was Transacted between the Father and the Son, we know no more than they have Revealed to us; and we know they had no Design to Impose upon Mankind, by laying so much weight upon such Conditions as God had no Regard to; and by Concealing from them such a *Change of Persons* as made them *Compleatly Righteous* without any Act of theirs. Men could never be Reconciled to the just Veneration and Esteem we have of the Sacred Penmen of the Scriptures, nor to their Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Gospel, nor to their Fidelity in declaring them for the Good of Mankind. So that if we find nothing of this *Change of Persons* in their Writings, and so much as is utterly inconsistent with it, we have all the Reason in the World to Reject it.

This Notion of the *Change of Persons* is attended with very bad Consequences. Which I do not charge on those who do not see them, or are carrried by some higher Principles above them; but we are not to Judge of Persons but of Things, and the Natural Tendency of Principles.

And so the *Change of Persons* in this Sense hath these very had Consequences: That it is apt to Lessen our Reverence of the Divine Perfections; our just Sense of the Differences of Good and Evil; Our Obligations to all sorts of Duties; It tends to the Disparagement of that *Free Grace* they pretend to Exalt; and Exposes the Gospel to the Reproach and Contempt of Infidels, and leaves the Minds of those who embrace it, under Great Temptations to *Presumption*.

These things I can only mention, because you desired a short Answer to your Questions, and I have brought it into as narrow a Compass as I could.

I am Sir,

Nov. 10. 97. *Your Faithful Friend and Servant,*

ED. WIGORN.

The Learned Doctor Edwards's *Answer to the same Three Questions; in a Letter to Mr.* Williams; *occasioned by Mr.* Lob's Remarks. *Wherein he pretends the Doctor's Preservative against Socinianism, condemns Mr.* Williams's *Judgment concerning a change of Persons.*

SIR,

I Have perused the Passages which you refer to, (viz. *Gospel-Truth stated*, p. 37, 40. the places objected among the rest) besides severel other parts of your Books, though I have not as yet had Leisure sufficient to read them over; However I have read enough to know your Opinion, and to understand how you state the Matter in debate between you and your Antinomian Adversaries; and thereby am sufficiently instructed to answer your Queries. To the First therefore I say, That when speaking of the Sufferings of our Saviour, I assert, as other Divines usually do, a Permutation of Persons: *I mean no more than what you affirm*; *viz.* That Christ not only died for the good, but likewise *vice*, or *loco peccatorum*, in the room and place of Sinners. But when we assert an Exchange, or Permutation of Persons, this must always be understood under such Restrictions and Limitations as may help us to avoid those two Dangerous Errors which the *Antinomians* have Fallen into. And therefore, *First*, We must affirm, we mean no more thereby then an obligation to Punishment, which he no otherwise Contracted then by his own Free and Voluntary consent and undertaking, to undergo that Punishment which the Law threatned, and our Sins deserved, *Viz.* Death. But this must by no means be so far misconstrued, as to imagine that thereby the Filth and

and Turpitude of our sins were Transferred upon him: For tho in the former Sense, he is said to be made sin for us; yet in the latter he still continued Holy, Harmless, Undefiled, separate from Sinners, and at an Eternal distance from them. Neither, *Secondly*, Must this Permutation be extended so far as to imply a Reciprocal Exchange of Persons, *Viz.* Of us Sinners, into the Room and Place of Christ; As if God did look upon us as doing all that Christ did, and consequently, that we do Merit Pardon, attone Justice, compleatly satisfy and fulfill the Law, so that we are actually discharged from Punishment without more ado. No, we continue still under the sentence of the Law, Notwithstanding all that Christ did to free us from it, till we perform those Conditions upon which the application of Pardon is suspended. The immediate therefore Effect and Consequence of the Permutation which we are speaking of, is only this, that Christ by dying in our room, had so far reconciled us to his Father, as that he is willing to Pardon and admit us to his favour, provided that we on our Parts perform the Conditions of the New Covenant, *Viz.* Repentance and Faith. For tho Christ by dying for us hath merited our Pardon, yet it still continues so far in his own Power, as that he will not dispose of it, but upon such Terms as have been agreed upon between him and his Father; which indeed are no other then such, as without which we are neither capable of Pardon, nor can God in Honour bestow it upon us. To apply Pardon to a Sinner while he continues in his obstinacy and impenitence, is not only contrary to the Holyness of God, but inconsistent with his wisdom, and destructive of his Authority and Government. And therefore the Graces before mentioned must be looked upon by us, to be both the necessary Parts of every Christians Duty, and the indispensible conditions of his Happyness. (In another Letter) I intend no

more by an Exchange of Persons, than what you have affirmed in your Writings. As to your Second Query, I Judge those Assertions and Acknowledgments frequently made by you in your Books concerning the sufferings of Christ, and the satisfaction thereby made to the Justice of God for the Sins of Men, do fully acquit you from giving any Countenance to the Errors of *Socinus* in that point. (In another Letter) you have very rightly, and in an Orthodox manner Stated the Doctrine of Christs satisfaction: And it is in perfect agreement with the Doctrine of our own and all the reformed Churches, and therefore fully acquits you from the Imputation of *Socinianism*. *Thirdly*, As to the Doctrine of Dr. *Crisp* and others of that Sect, who affirm such a Permutation of Persons between Christ and Sinners; as if to all intents and purposes, they were to be looked upon in the Room and Place of each other; So that Christ is to be Accounted the Swearer, Drunkard, Blasphemer on one Hand, and the Sinner to be perfectly Righteous on the other; I cannot but look upon it to be not only false, absurd, impossible, but likewise an Impious and Blasphemous Opinion; as being highly Dishonourable to our Saviour, repugnant to the Wisdom and Justice of God, and tends plainly to subvert the whole design of Christianity; which is hereby exposed to the just and unanswerable Reproaches of its Adversaries, which can never be wiped off, if the Opinion be true. I would say a great deal more upon this occasion, if it were necessary, but what I have thus briefly suggested, may I suppose be sufficient for your present purpose. And if you think that what I have wrote may be any way Serviceable to the common cause of our Holy Religion, I give you leave to make what use you think fit of it; and in the mean time remain

Sir,

Jesus Coll. Oxon.
Oct. 28. 97.

Your assured Servant,
Jonathan Edwards.

I had not given this trouble to these Great Men; But that Mr. *Lob* makes frequent use of their Testimony against my Judgment, in favour of them whom I oppose. And being no Authors better understand, and more effectually oppose *Socinianism*, I was sure their Vindication of me would be past exception, and therefore made bold to propose to them, whether they intended more by a Commutation of Persons than I did affirm in my Books (which I sent them.) *Secondly*, Whether I was by the Passages excepted against in my Book (by the First Paper and Mr. *Lob*) chargeable with *Socinianism*. *Thirdly*, What their Judgment was concerning that *Change of Persons* which I oppose, and Dr. *Crisp* and others of that Sect affirm. To these Questions they were pleased to send these Answers, with a Permission to Print them. I think, every Man will conclude from what they say, that they Account our Holy Religion is struck at by what Errors I oppose; and that Mr. *Lob* doth wrest their Books when he cites them in Confutation of what I affirm. I might have added another Letter of this *R. R.* Bishop to the same effect, and wherein he proves that God was not displeased with Christ: And also of the said Reverend Doctor *Edwards*. But these published abundantly suffice.

Some Animadversions on Mr. Lob's DEFENCE of the REPORT. *By* D. W. *Note, I call the Author of the* Rebuke, Mr. R.

THough I have the Testimony of the Ministers and Elders of all the Dissenting Congregations in *Dublin* (except One) for my Peaceableness and Diligence in the promoting of Union there; yet being indu-

industriously branded as the great Divider in this place, it's necessary to represent the Cause of Mens Mistakes. To me is ascribed the Rise of our Divisions, because at the Request of several Ministers, after other means were unsuccessful, I wrote *Gospel-Truth stated*; when Dr. *Crisp*'s Re-printed Book so obtained as to threaten our Ministry. The Continuance of our Breaches I am charged with, on no better pretence than this, A beaten Man makes all that Noise which proceeds from the furious blows that fall upon his Person. I consented to that Expedient 1692. wherein all objected against my Book was adjusted, and gave no Cause for the Objectors to violate that Agreement. Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *T.* Mr. *K.* Mr. *E.* &c. wrote Volumes against that Book; to all which I replied in a Defence of Six Sheets; thinking that sufficient, and in hopes some Rest might be obtained by silence. Mr. *M.* revives the Assault with a Charge of Blasphemy and Damning Errors; This extorted one small book more. Then by Contrivances I was voted out of the Lecture at *Pinners-Hall*. Whereupon Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *How*, Mr. *Alsop* and my self, remove to *Salters-Hall*. About two Months after this my Morals (upon a search back to my Childhood) are Impeached, the united Ministers unanimously adjudged and declared me clear and innocent of all that was laid to my Charge. I forbear Recriminations against many, for which I am furnished. The same Book comes again upon the Stage with Mr. *Lobs* Objections, which I answered in one sheet. Mr. *Lob* rejoineth, but at the Reverend Doctor *Bates* request, I laid aside a Book ready for the Press. The Doctor and I fully agree in Sense, Notwithstanding he had used some Phrases which Mr. *Lob* hoped to divide us by. They stop not here, as the result of many private Meetings with my Adversaries; A Paper is gotten Subscribed (when I was at *Bath*) by some at least of my Friends, who fully agreed with me in Doctrine.

Herein

Herein there were ſeveral miſtakes in matters of Fact refering to the Subſcription to my Book, many inſinuated reflections (not deſigned by all) againſt the Doctrine of that Book, with ſuch Ambiguities and Omiſſions, as endangered the Truths by me defended, and thoſe Terms propoſed to me, which might ſtartle a Man they had no Power over, and juſtly expected better treatment at leaſt from ſuch whoſe cauſe I pleaded. Yet when this Paper was laid aſide, and the Third Paper agreed to, I ſate ſtill, tho I knew that Firſt Paper (unprinted) was ſent through the Nation to my great Detriment. Might not one expect ſome quiet after ſuch various attempts againſt this Book and its Author? (Which I do not aſcribe to the Congregational, as a body, nor had I mentioned moſt of theſe things, if I were not charged with all our diviſions.) My hopes are diſappointed; Mr. *Lob* Printeth his Report, wherein the United Miniſters for my ſake are branded for *Socinians*, and therein inſerts that unhappy Paper. Nay, he ſoon follows this with his *Remarks*, to faſten his charge the deeper upon me. Stops he here? No, in this his *Defence* I am ſtill pelted, my Doctrine groſsly Arraigned, the Learned Mr. *R.* Cenſured as a *Socinian* for defending me. My Book ſuſtains the Clamour, becauſe it denies the *Criſpian Change of Perſon*, Nay, he hopeth it hath ſome inviſible evil thing within its Bowels, which if I do not bring forth (for no body elſe can) I muſt be one offenſive and halting, *p.* 88. Nay, as if firſt in intention, the laſt Words in his Book are, whether Mr. *Williams* be ſincere or no, *he muſt now ſhew it*; *FINIS*. The *Engliſh* of this is, if I be ſincere I muſt ſhew my ſelf Erroneous, that they may have ſomewhat to juſtify their paſt Clamours; for as yet they can prove nothing, and yet (will you not wonder) he gives me, *p.* 9. more hopes of their Charity and Communion, if I will but write Errors plainly, than they can now allow

low me when I assert the opposite Truths. Am not I in a streight? He and others call and provoke me to write, (and they might do it long enough, if the interest of the Gospel, and such injuries to my Friend assisted not their Calls.) Yet if I write, I shall be deem'd, the cause of all our Divisions: But so 'twill be if I write not; Nay, if I be not *felo de se*. I shall therefore adventure, so pressed by Mr. *Lob*, to give him some hasty thoughts. I may well Call it an adventure, for I foresee, unless he is much changed since he wrote this *Defence*, He will mis-represent what is written with the greatest Caution, and if his Readers shall think him a fair adversary, he is sure to have the better of any Man, as will soon appear. Mr. *Lob*, *p.* 35. 'The Phrase of a Change of Christs Person was never invented, till the Gentleman who engaged my Brother to enter upon this sorrowful undertaking, started it. And to speak the Truth, it's a Phrase only adjusted, to express no more than what the *Socinians* do constantly grant, for they say that Christ, tho he suffered not the Punishment due to us for sin, yet he endured grievous and dolorous Pains, which is aptly enough expressed, when it is said, there was a Change of Christs Person for us, for he was, say these Hereticks, *Changed from Ease to Pain for our good.*

Note, 1. The Phrase, *Change of Person*, was used by Dr. *Crisp*, and therefore not invented by me, (whom he meaneth) it's from him I cited it. 2. Is it so ill a Phrase, and serves only a *Socinian* purpose? Then Mr. *Lob* should not make me a *Socinian*, only for denying this Phrase. He saith, (and that when he will speak the Truth) it's *adjusted only* to express what the *Socinians* constantly grant, and yet Quarrels me for denying this dangerous expression. 3. If this bad Phrase, Change of Person, and that good Phrase Change of Persons differ so far as Heterodox and Orthodox;

thodox; did not Mr. *Lob* deal unfairly all this while, in telling the World I denied that *Good* Phraſe *Change of Perſons*, only becauſe I had denied this bad Phraſe *Change of Perſon*? for I aſſure you, I no where deny a Change of Perſons in the Plural Number (tho according to his Liberty he ſaith I did, *p.* 42.) and I fully aſſert the ſound Senſe of it, as the *R. R. the Biſhop of* Worceſter *and the Reverend Dr.* Edwards *do Witneſs*, and they are Men he makes great uſe of in his Book, as very ſound in this point: But being more concerned for my Friend, Mr. *Rebuker*, I ſhall with this place, begin an Account of ſome of the Stabbing injuries he receives from Mr. *Lob*, with *an Art thou in Health my Brother?*

1. Mr. *Lob* makes Mr. *R*—— here to ſay (with the *Socinians*) that there was a Change only in the Perſon of Chriſt, without an Exchange at all with Sinners; becauſe Mr. *R.* ſaith, there was a Change of the Perſon of Chriſt, in exchange for the Perſons of Sinners (tho not reciprocally in all reſpects) this is plain; for a meer Change from Eaſe to Pain, is only a Change in Chriſts Perſon, *p.* 31. he ſaith, 'My Brother is in good earneſt only for a Change of Chriſts Perſon, without 'a Change between Chriſt and us: When *Reb. p.* 44. 'this Phraſe the Change of the Perſon of Chriſt, hath 'truly an honeſt ſound Senſe, *Viz.* The ſubſtitution of 'one Perſon in the Room of another; And a proper redemption may be obtained by the Puniſhment 'of one in the Room of another—If therefore 'Chriſts dying by way of Change, or *Exchange*, be 'all they would have, its granted, *&c.*] Yet from this very place Mr. *Lob* infers, as above.

2. Mr. *Lob* repreſents Mr. *R.* to hold with the *Socinians*, that Chriſt ſuffered *only ſo* for our Good, as not to ſuffer truly in *our ſtead*. Becauſe Mr. *R.* affirmed, that Chriſts ſuffering properly in our ſtead was for our good. Mr. *Lob* ſaith, *p.* 47. 'Whatever my Bro-

'ther

'ther intends, it's manifeſt, that while he Calls the 'Socinian Senſe of Chriſts dying in our ſtead, Knaviſh- 'He gives the very Senſe of this Phraſe, which the 'Socinians who uſe it do give. and by it means (if we 'may Judge his meaning by his words) no more than 'what Socinus Crellius, and that fraternity do conſi- 'ſtently with a denial of Chriſts ſatisfaction con- 'ſtantly grant. He ſaith worſe the lines before. See alſo, p. 36. and 10 times repeats, &c. The Place he grounds this upon is, Reb. p. 35. [' The Caviller pro- 'ceeds, in our place and ſtead, with ſome ſignify no 'more, than for our good; Why, it's impoſſible they 'ſhould: That which Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead is 'for our Good, to bear the Puniſhment of our ſins, to 'ſatisfy Divine Juſtice, was certainly for our good, &c. 'Therefore for our good becauſe in our ſtead.] Reader, is not Chriſts bearing the Puniſhment of our ſins to ſatisfy Divine Juſtice, ſuffering properly in our ſtead? And is ſuffering properly in our ſtead, and ſuffering in our ſtead in the Socinian Senſe, (Viz. Improperly and not at all) the ſame thing? But Mr. R. ſaid, it's impoſſible in our ſtead, ſhould ſignify any more than for our good. I Anſwer, That it is conſidered with reſpect to our concernment therein, as it is a benefit deſigned for us; but not to exclude its being in our place and ſtead, which he fully aſſerts, and without which we had been ruined for ever. Is not Mans chief end to be happy in the Enjoyment of God? And doth not Chriſts dying properly in our ſtead ſubſerve that end? Mr. Lob might better ſay, Mr. R. denied that Chriſts dying in our ſtead was for Gods Glory, to which our good is Subordinate, than that he denied that Chriſt dyed properly in our ſtead, becauſe as to our own felicity it did no more than ſubſerve it, or was it for our hurt, or could it be more beneficial to us than for our good, for it's only as to our benefit he applies the Words.

5. Mr.

3. Mr. *Lob* Repreſents Mr. *R.* to deny (with the *Socinians*) that Chriſts ſufferings are a *Proper Puniſhment* for our Sins: When Mr. *R.* doth moſt expreſsly aſſert, that Chriſts ſufferings were the Puniſhments of our Sins, for ſatisfaction to the Vindicative Juſtice of God. Mr. *Lob*, *p.* 48. agreeably hereto (the *Socinians* trifling in a wretched Senſe, and rejecting of Phraſes to make Chriſts ſufferings not penal) my Brother, as he rejects thePhraſes of ſuſtaining thePerſon of Sinners, and puts an unſound Senſe on Chriſts ſuffering in our place and ſtead; ſo that word (anſwering the obligation of the Violated Law) which was in the firſt Paper, to make it evident that we eſteemed Chriſts ſufferings to be proper Puniſhments, is rejected; as what cannot in my Brothers Opinion bear a ſound Senſe. This charge that Mr. *R.* denies Chriſts ſufferings to be Puniſhments, he impoſeth in very many Pages. Whereas Mr. *R.* ſaith, *p.* 35. Chriſt did bear the *Puniſhment of our ſins to the ſatisfaction of Juſtice*, p. 48. And it's freely granted that Chriſt ſuffered and dyed for the Perſons of Sinners, and for the ſins of their Perſons, and in the room and ſtead of their Perſons; *And that he ſuffered and dyed to make ſatisfaction to the Juſtice, to the Vindicative Juſtice of God*, &c.

What pretends Mr. *Lob* againſt ſo full conviction? No other than that we by the Third Paper *rejected* this Phraſe, obligations of the violated Law: But this is not true, we only *waved it*, and Mr. *R.* ſaith no more. But Mr. *Lob* ſaith, the Phraſe which we put in its ſtead, *Viz. Chriſt came to Anſwer for ſinners violation of the Law of Works*, differs as much from their Phraſe, anſwering for us the obligations of the violated Law of Works, *as a Goſpel Truth and a Socinian Error*, p. 50. One would think it's ſtill a true Phraſe after his mangling it. But pray take it as in our Paper. 'Chriſt 'came into our room and ſtead to Anſwer for our Vi-'olations of the Law (add what follows) and the 'Puniſh-

'Punishment of our sins was inflicted on Christ, 'that God might without injury to his Justice Pardon 'and Save penitent Believers. Is this a *Socinian Error*? Or, is a word wanting to make Christs sufferings proper Punishments? Nay, what is it for Christ in our stead to Answer for our Violations? But go yet lower: Is not to *Answer for our sins*, another thing than *Socinians* hold? even this is no less than suffering the Punishment of our sins, if we were for Violating the Law under its obligations, to suffer those Punishments: But I come to Mr. *Lob*'s charge against Mr. *R.* from the words, *cannot bear a sound Sense.*

4. Because Mr. *R.* used certain warm words once, and that only against the unsound Sense of that *single* Phrase, Commutation of Persons (which yet he there saith, may be capable of receiving a sound meaning) Mr. *Lob* makes Mr. *R.* to intend those warm words against the sound Sense of that Phrase, against that Phrase it self, and a great many other good Phrases which himself makes use of as very safe, yea, against the sound Sense of many other Phrases which Mr. *R.* pleads for. I shall fully recite the only place upon which Mr. *Lob* grounds his charge, *Reb.* p. 30. ['A 'change of Persons, which may possibly be capable of 'receiving a *good meaning* (elsewhere explained) and 'yet is more sounding towards a dangerous Sense, the 'Brethren did unanimously agree to grant as much as the 'sound Sense could bear, and modestly to wave and 'pass by the other, *which was liable* to be interpreted to 'a Sense, and sound of malignity to the whole of the 'Gospel.] You see *the other* which could not bear a sound Sense, but was liable to a sound of malignity, is but one thing, for *other* is not *nomen multitudinis*, and agrees with the Verb *WAS*, which is in the singular Number. This *other*, to which these words are appropriated, cannot be the *Phrase*, Commutation of Persons, for that is not waved, but retained by us in the Third Paper;

not

nor can it be the found Senſe of that Phraſe, for that's provided for by Mr. *R.* much leſs can it be all the Phraſes and Paſſages in the firſt Paper omitted in the Third. It muſt then be confined to ſome one thing expreſſive of the unſound Senſe, which the *Criſpians* put upon the Phraſe Change of Perſons; Mr. *R*'s. following words point at, [And the Brethren are now more fully perſwaded they are in the right by the *Reporters* Notions.] What's that? Such a change as makes *Chriſt to be deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs Entitling to Eternal Life, and to become ſin as we are ſin: Rep.* p. 5. 7, *i. e.* filthy ſinners.

Yet upon this foreſaid Paſſage of Mr. *R.* Mr. *Lob* ſays, *p.* 14. ['This Paſſage of my Reverend Brothren 'doth make it manifeſt, that the Paragraphs, 'Terms and Phraſes, which were in the Firſt Paper, 'and were waved and paſſed by in the Compoſure of 'the Third, are looked upon by my Brother, as what 'could not bear a ſound Senſe, but a ſound of malig-'nity to the whole of the Goſpel; that is to ſay, the 'Phraſe of Chriſts taking on him the Perſon of Sin-'ners, of Anſwering for us the obligations of the 'Violated Law of Works, the Term ſurety, and the 'Aſſertion of the neceſſity of a Commutation of Per-'ſons---This is the Senſe of my Reverend Brother.] And ſo theſe words cannot bear a ſound, *&c.* Are trumped up I believe forty times with theſe by tail, *p.* 48. to 65. nay, in this laſt, *p.* 65. ['According to 'what my Brother declares, it muſt be ſuppoſed; this 'Paſſage, (*Viz.* Regeneration, Repentance towards 'God, Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and a Holy 'Converſation, are by Gods word manifeſtly neceſſa-'ry to the ſalvation of a Sinner) *Cannot bear a ſound 'Senſe, but is liable to be interpreted to a Senſe and Sound 'of malignity.*] Muſt not Mr. *R.* tho thus loudly warned, find it impoſſible to guard himſelf againſt this Man?

5. Mr. R. p. 17. ſaith, [' Theſe Phraſes, Terms, or Expreſſions, *Viz.* Change of Perſons between Chriſt ' and us, and his taking on him the Perſon of Sinners, ' are unknown to our Confeſſions and not to be found ' in the Body of Confeſſions.] Mr. *Lob* expoſeth him by Citing a Confeſſion that uſeth ſome Phraſes, Mr. *R.* makes uſe of, and others which he never denied, but mentions no Confeſſion that hath the Phraſes Mr. *R.* ſaid, could not be found. Upon this poor work he toiles from, *p.* 71. to 80. I muſt ſtay a little on what occurs, *p.* 73. and ask, 1. When Mr. *R.* denied only that theſe *Phraſes* (not the ſound Senſe) were in the Confeſſions? why ſhould Mr. *Lob* make him deny that the Confeſſions gave any Countenance to the *ſound Senſe* of thoſe Phraſes? 2. When Mr. *Lob* declares he had been *ſilent*, if he had not found theſe Phraſes in ſome Confeſſions, and Ridicules Mr. *R.* for denying they were in them; Why did not he ſhew theſe Phraſes, or one of them in ſome or other Confeſſion? 3. If theſe Phraſes, as to the Letters and Syllables (which Mr. *R.* called for) are wherever the ſound Senſe of them is to be found, (Which is, what Mr. *Lob* pretends, or fondly argues) why doth he deny that the very Phraſes Chriſt taking on him the Perſon of Sinners, *&c.* Are in the Third Paper, and ſay they are rejected by us, ſeeing the ſound Senſe of thoſe very Phraſes is there? 4. Mr. *Lob* ſaith, [' The Phraſes of Change of Perſons, of Chriſts ſuſtaining our Perſon, of his being ' ſubſtituted into our Room, and his ſuffering in our ' place and ſtead, are ſo nearly allied that they live ' and dye together, grant one and all neceſſarily come ' in with it, *&c.*] They muſt then be of the ſame adequate Senſe with each other, or the Confeſſion could not aſſert Chriſts ſuſtaining in our Perſon, by its ſaying, Chriſt dyed in our ſtead: But if the Senſe be adequate, then Mr. *R.* denies the right Senſe of none of theſe Phraſes, for he aſſerts, *Chriſt dyed properly in our*

place

place and ſtead, and that he was ſubſtituted in our Room. Whence it will be no better by Mr. *Lobs* own Confeſſion, than that he makes all this Noiſe to ſhew his *Copia Verborum*: He will have the mentioning of each of the various words of the ſame ſignification, to be Terms of Communion, and the omiſſion of any one as great a bar to it, as if the very ſenſe of all thoſe words were denied; Ay, and that when the full juſt ſenſe of any of thoſe words is granted. For my part, after all his big words, from *p.* 58. to 65. about *Logical Terms, or meer humane forms of Speech*, (Tho I believe, they who drew up the Third Paper never dreamt of ſuch deſigns, as he with ſomewhat too like, malice faſtens on them) I would think him a Turbulent, uncharitable Sciſmatick, who would divide from others meerly becauſe they ſcrupled this or that humane form of words, ſo they held and plainly expreſſed the Scriptural Truth deſigned by thoſe words, yea, tho they expreſſed it by Terms leſs proper. How much more culpable is it then, to raiſe ſuch ſtorms only for our omitting a Phraſe, becauſe leſs intelligible to the People, more capable of being abuſed by the Etimology and Acceptation thereof among the Vulgar, and known to be groſsly abuſed by the *Criſpians* from that occaſion. May not Mr. *Lob* Commence as juſt a War, if People ſhould omit his fine Phraſe, *Zeal for Populacy*, and yet be willing to uſe their plain Phraſe, Zeal for Popularity. But to conclude this head: I deny that his Change of Perſons, or Chriſts ſuffering in our Perſon, or in the *Criſpian* Senſe, or his own, as Stated, *Rep.* p. 5. are included in or to be proved from the Confeſſion: to pretend the literal Phraſes from ſuch words as Chriſt dyed in our ſtead, was ſubſtituted in our Room, is ſordid, and the Confeſſors meaning in thoſe words, is contrary to the *Criſpian* and *Reporters Senſe*; And therefore Mr. *Lobs* Phraſes are not at all proved from the Confeſſions; unleſs a thing be proved where the

Phraſe is unmentioned and the Senſe oppoſed.

6. Mr. *Lob*, that he might bring his *Engliſh* Reader to Judge Mr. *R.* a baffled Man, leaves out a conſiderable word in his Tranſlating a part of the *Scotch* Confeſſion, *p.* 81. [It became the Redeemer to be true God, and true Man, becauſe he was to ſuffer the Puniſhments due for our ſins, and to appear [*Quaſi in perſona, noſtra coram judicio patris, pro noſtra tranſgreſſione & in obedientia pati*, in our Perſon before the Judgment-Seat of the Father, to ſuffer for our Tranſgreſſions and Diſobedience.] Thus Mr. *Lob Engliſheth* the *Latin* words, and boaſteth--*Here you ſee the Church of Scotland uſeth this very Phraſe*, &c. But leaſt his admirers ſhould applaud his conqueſt to an indecency, it's fit they know there's a word *QUASI*, which Mr. *Lob* did not think for his purpoſe to *Engliſh*. He ought to have ſaid thus; And to appear [*AS IT WERE*] in our Perſon, that is, Chriſt appeared not properly in our Perſon; that Phraſe is too hard, tho there be ſomewhat towards it in ſome certain reſpect; As *Calvin* in this caſe uſeth *Quodamodo*. But Mr. *Lob*, by leaving out *Quaſi*, performs what he undertook, p. 73. *Perhaps it may appear* (i. e. to the Engliſhman) *that the Phraſe moſt expoſed by him will be found literally in one or other Confeſſion.* Theſe words Cited are all, by which he makes it to *appear*, and *Quaſi* Anſwers to *perhaps*. Nay, had the diminutive *Quaſi* been out, he is not ſure it had ſerved his turn.

But conſidering the wonted Freedom of the Man, I wonder he left not out this *Quaſi*. For I could give many inſtances, where the very next words omitted by him, would have defeated his purpoſe by what he Citeth. But, To prevent a ſnare, I'll prefer that in His *Letter to Dr. Bates*, p. 17. he ſaith, many held Chriſt and us to be *one Perſon in Law*; (And) that it may be ſaid, that we *ſuffered in Chriſt*, is the import of that aſſertion which ſaith, that Chriſt ſuffered as our

ſurety;

ſurety; and is allowed by Mr. *Baxter*; (juſt againſt this, Mr. *Lob* Cites in the Margin) *It is not ſo aptly ſaid he ſatisfied, as that he ſuffered in the Perſon of ſinners*, Mr. Baxter, *Cath. Theol. Part* 2. p. 79. (It ſhould be, *p.* 76, 77.) Amazed, I took Mr. *Baxters* Book, and found the very next words were; *Note*, 'That it is not any 'other Mans Perſon that Chriſt ſuffered in, but his 'own, and we *mean*, that he took upon him the Perſon 'of a Sinner himſelf, in as much as he conſented to 'ſuffer for ſin, and ſo Perſonating here, is *not* becoming any other Mans Perſon in *Law-Senſe*, *ſo as that 'other legally ſuffered what he did*; but it is *only* his own 'Perſon's becoming a ſufferer in the ſtead of ſinners 'for their ſins---(And two or three lines before Mr. 'Baxter tells us) *To ſay that Chriſt ſatisfied in our Perſon, and we by him*; *is falſe, and ſubverts the Goſpel.*

Or why did not Mr. *Lob ſplit* the word *Quaſi*, and leave out the laſt ſillable *ſi*, then *qua* being oft *redulplicative*, had better fitted, thus he ſerved me, *Man made Righteous*, p. 108. I had ſaid, 'Therefore Chriſt 'HEREIN is what the *Civilians* Call, *An ex promiſſor*, 'he ſuffered alone, tho he Acts for another. Mr. *Lob* in his Letter to Dr. *Bates*, *p.* 12. 13. to expoſe me as unlearned, and himſelf skilful, Recites ſeveral properties of an *Expromiſſor*, and will have me to mean that all theſe did belong to Chriſt, and then infers what pleaſed himſelf; whereas I had by the entire word *Herein*, limited it to one property of an *Ex promiſſor*, *Viz. He is obliged alone*, tho he Acts for another, (in Redemption-work.) Mr. *Lob* ſeeing the word *Herein* would mar his project, He fairly ſplits the word, leaves out *In*, and makes it (*a loco*) *HERE* and ſo found Scope for his purpoſe. Theſe few Inſtances of many, may convince how unfit Mr. *Lob* is to report other Mens words, tho his Talent ſeems confined to the Collecting and Publiſhing what Authors write; 'twere well for his Readers, he did it with more of true Judg-

ment, and leſs of Trick; for thereby his Quotations would more edify, and require leſs care and pains to become ſure the Authors are not miſ-repreſented.

7. Men will ſcarce Judge it decent or prudent in Mr. *Lob*, (if in his Friend) to publiſh by that Letter to himſelf, a reflection on the Rebuker for his Loyalty to the preſent Government, as inconſiſtent with a few Rhetorical expreſſions, in addreſs to the *Late King James*, (to whom his obligations were ſomewhat peculiar:) But whereby doth his *meaning appear ſo inſincere* at that time? Or what is done by him ſince, *ſo contradictious to what he ſaid*, as to render him an *exemplar of inſincerity* now? No other than ſwearing allegiance to King *William*, Signing the Aſſociation and Carrying it, becoming a Loyal Subject in his Prayers, Sermons, and Peaceable behaviour and advices? What Fetters are ſome in, If once addreſſing the Late King by a few big words, muſt Eternally Proclaim a Man an Hypocrite, unleſs he be now a *Non-juror*, *Nonaſſociator*, *Plotter*, and director of other Miniſters (in imitation of himſelf) to pray ſo for the King, as either of the two Kings may be intended, if they muſt at all ſeem to Pray for King *William*. I hope, few will be gull'd into ſuch a Character, from the fancied obligations of former addreſſes (tho ſome of them were highly inconſiderate), nor any diſcouraged from perſevering Loyalty by the forecited Aſperſion. This would admit enlargement, which provocations might improve. But I retain a reſpect ſufficient to forbid it, nor had I inſerted the leaſt hint at ſuch things, except as a warning againſt the like inſtances, when His *Firſt-Rate Man* is to Execute his *Fiery* threats, and his very Learned Perſon already *Rouſed* (alike obnoxious) ſtretcheth forth his *Claws*. Let Men take their way, but the common intereſt will not long be Sacrificed, ere ſome (now impoſed on) will find out the Inſtruments and Deſigns of our Breaches. I hope, the Reverend Rebuker

buker will Pardon my Interposal, and that I acquainted him not therewith. His abilities for a reply, I acknowledge such, that if these short hints serve for a foile to that he is preparing, and in the interim abate the ill Impressions of Mr. *Lobs* attempt, I shall Account these few hours well employed, which otherwise had been more feelingly spent in resenting those base reflections, that I am his *Leader*, *Master*, *Principal*, and what else became, scarce any Man besides Mr. *Lob*, their Author.

Mr. *Lob*, *p.* 8. owneth, I asserted, besides the effects made ours, the Righteousnes of Christ is imputed to Believers, but adds, *I mean nothing by this grant*: Because I use a simile to illustrate the manner, in *Man made Righteous*, p. 77. If one give me my Liberty, which he Voluntarily purchased for me at a dear rate. He mediately gives me what he paid for my Ransom, tho immediately he gives me my Liberty and a *right thereto.*

A. Had he Cited the *Apodosis*, which is in the next words, He had spoiled his suggestion, I shall Contract what I there enlarge on. I make Pardon and Adoption to be benefits, or *effects following* upon the Imputation of Christs Righteousnes. And the Righteousnes of Christ I distinguish into, 1. His performance of the conditions of redemption. 2. His right (or *jus adjudicatum*) by the Covenant of redemption, to our Pardon and Adoption; for his performance of the conditions adjusted in that Covenant. The former I said, is *mediately imputed.* The latter I said, is *immediately imputed*; it's reckoned to us when believers, because it was acquired expresly for believers, *John* 3. 16. *Isa.* 53. 10, 11. The judicial imputation of *this right of Christ intervening*; the Righteousnes of Christ (as a performance of the conditions) is imputed as our Plea for that Pardon, it being the procuring cause of that right of Christs, which is *immediately* imputed to

us. And this right I also distinguish from that which the Gospel-promise made to believers doth invest them in, for the former right results *immediately to Christ*, from the Covenant of Redemption, and is subjectively in him, tho imputed to us: Whereas the promise, he that believes shall be forgiven, or saved, not only supposeth the former Transactions, and is the Instrument by which God imputeth Christs Righteousness to the believer; But it also, as a conditional promise, giveth believers a right to Forgiveness, whereof they are the immediate Subjects. Here Mr. *Lob* may see the Vanity of his Objection; it is not Pardon, or such possessed effects that intermediate between Christs Righteousness and us, nor only the right given by the Gospels conditional grant. No, it's *Christs own right*, and that imputed to us by God himself, and that immediately to us. And Pray, Is Gods imputing to us Christs performance of the conditions, so far as to be our Plea and Foundation of Claim, no imputation of his Righteousness at all, because the imputation of Christs acquired right Intervenes? Nothing is left out but Gods Legal accounting us to have performed all that, by which Christ merited and made Atonement. Yet without this Proud assumption, nothing will please Mr. *Lob*.

Being so often pressed to it by Mr. *Humfreys* and Mr. *Lob*, I will endeavour their satisfaction. If Christ had acquired by his Death a Power indefinitely to forgive sins, without a Compact determining (either by Name or Qualification) the Persons that should be Pardoned in the Virtue of his Death, or only purchased the Gospel Covenant, as conditionally offering Pardon; I should agree with Mr. *H.* but it being otherwise, I differ from him. And add, as the possessed effects are not properly imputed, so I will not confine the support of my Faith ultimately, and only to the Gospel conditional promise (tho that's infallible)

when

when God hath made the Compact between the Father and our Mediator, to be my ſecurity, and Chriſts performance of the conditions of that Compact to be my Plea with God, among which conditions was what Anſwers the Law of Works, which I have Tranſgreſſed. Altho I own I muſt try my intereſt by Chriſts Goſpel Law, as what deſcribeth the Perſon who is Entitled to Pardon, and injoyneth us to be ſuch, with a promiſe of that intereſt. In ſhort, a believer having for his Security and Plea, the Goſpel promiſe, the Covenant of Redemption and the Value of Chriſts Death, I'll retain each; and therefore ſtill ſay, *Beſides the effects poſſeſſed by me, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to me*, as above Accounted for.

On the other hand, could I think it was by the Covenant of Works, that Chriſt was conſtituted our ſurety, ſo that his obligations to ſuffer the Puniſhment of our ſins, did *immediately* reſult from that Law; And that we Sinners were *Principals in Redemption Work*, and Chriſt ſuch a ſurety as to be *Joint Party* with us in that Work of Redemption. And that the Law of Works required the *Divine Nature*, to give a value to what it Accounted to be Righteouſneſs. And laſtly, that this Law *promiſeth Pardon* to ſinners for the ſake of a Mediators ſufferings; I ſhould then agree with Mr. *Lob*, that we ſatisfied for our ſin, dyed, and obeyed in Chriſts Perſon, and he and we paid the *Idem*. Nay, be a full *Criſpian* and ſay, I was juſtified at the time of Chriſts Death; I had nothing to do to become partaker of the effects of that Death, I was as Righteous as Chriſt, deny any proper forgiveneſs, Nay, own that Chriſt was *really* a ſinner; for I am ſure the Law could *immediately* oblige no other to dye.

But I muſt diſagree with Mr. *Lob* and them, Becauſe I am well perſwaded, God never propoſed the Work of Redemption to Condemned Sinners, but to Chriſt our Mediator. Alſo that to the Redemption

of

of Sinners, God in Justice requiring for the Honour of his Violated Law, that a perfect obedience, and the suffering of what was equivalent to its threatned Punishments, should in the Humane Nature be summitted to by the Redeemer. Our Blessed Mediator obliged himself to yield that obedience, and bear those Punishments, upon condition that such sinners should be forgiven in his right, who should comply with the Gospel Terms agreed upon between the Father and him. And pursuant hereto, our Mediator did in our Nature perfectly obey and suffer the Punishments of our sins, whereby he had a right to a believers Pardon, and believers do obtain it in the way above described. And Lastly, I am sure the Law of Works never promiseth Pardon to sinners for the sake of Christs sufferings, the Payment of the full *Idem* was impossible, (tho there was a supra-equivalent) and the Law accounteth that Righteousness perfect, which an Innocent Holy Creature renders, tho he have not, the Divine Nature to give that value to his obedience; without which (very thing) we had been entirely lost.

Here Mr. *Lob* may find a *surety*, *Viz.* An *obliged Mediator*. And under the *Law*, *Viz.* As an Article taken into the Covenant of Redemption, whereby Christ was obliged: And *in our stead*, *Viz.* We were Condemned to suffer, we are by and for his sufferings to be saved. Nay, he may find the sound meaning of his other Phrases, as *Change of Persons*, yea, *Christs suffering in the Person of sinners*. That is, Christ our obliged Mediator suffers in our stead what we were to suffer; yet it was that we might be delivered for it, but not legally reputed our selves to suffer. And yet here's place left for Pardon, a Gospel Law, Terms of Application, *&c.*

That none may mistake, Note, 1. I instance Pardon, *&c.* for brevity sake, but exclude no saving benefits, and distinguish saving benefits, which are used as Motives

to

to Duty in the Gospel, from the Duties which are Conditions of those benefits. 2. And therefore I speak not of Christ's peculiar purchasing Grace for the Elect effectually to perform those Conditions whereby, together with the Decree, their eventual salvation is secured. This is my Judgment; but I ought not to confound this with that adjustment of things, whereby the Gospel-Offer of salvation to all men, and the Gospel-Rule of conferring its benefits, and of our final Judgment, are provided for.

Mr. *Lob* oft objects a Contradiction, if I affirm a Change of Persons, and yet say, I deny there is a Change of Person.

Answ. Besides Answers already given, I say, without any design'd Affront, it's no greater than *Answer not a Fool according to his Folly*, yet *Answer a Fool according to his Folly*.

By thus gratifying Mr. *Lob*'s Imperious Humour, I am the freer to tell him,

1. I am sorry that he so boldly averreth many gross mistakes in mattter of Fact, *p.* 35. *I invented the Phrase Change of Person*; whereas I cite and use it as Dr. *Crisp*'s Phrase. P. 26. 43. *I deny a Change of Persons.* Whereas I never denied it; what I denied was Dr. *Crisp*'s Change of Person, and fully asserted the Sense of the other. P. 22. *I appealed to the Learned Witsius.* But this I never did. P. 7. *That onely Mr.* Toland *wrote much in praise of my Book.* Whereas he being then in *Holland* (and not the Man he since appears) desired them who gave an account of Published Books, to give their Judgment of my Book, and the great Praises are theirs, and others have since commended it above its worth. P. 63. *That I was the Contriver of the Third Paper.* Whereas others had drawn it up before I saw it. His vile Reflections on Mr. *R.* with respect to this, and his Nine Subscribers of the First Paper, *p.* 70. makes an account of that Matter necessary. The United Ministers

niſters appointed Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hamond*, Mr. *Slater*, Mr. *Hill*, with Mr. *How* and my ſelf, to compoſe an Expedient, *&c.* Two of the Brethren drew it up (which is this Third Paper) and brought it to the reſt of us met together: After ſome Alterations we did all agree to it, and brought it as our agreed Act to the Meeting at Saint *Hellen*. There, among the reſt, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Quick* and Mr. *Evans* agreed to it. Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Burgeſs*, and Mr. *Showers* not being preſent any of the times when it was read in the Meeting; it was brought to the View of Mr. *Alſop*, who approved of it. I am very ſure alſo it was ſhewn to Mr. *Burgeſs* (his Informer) who appeared to agree to it; and Mr. *Showers* did to more than one expreſs his Approbation of it. So that Mr. *Lob* hath all the Nine Subſcribers to my book enumerated. Mr. *Lob* ſomewhere ſaith, all the Phraſes of the firſt Paper, not into the Third, were rejected by my means; And yet ſeveral of them are in my own Paper, called the *Second*. Which I am glad was Printed ere I read his Defence. He ſaith the Third Paper denies a Commutation of Perſons, p. 14. when both Phraſe and Senſe are in it. Other inſtances are not wanting. It's falſe that the generality of the Paſtors do not approve my Book, though they were asked only to ſubſcribe the ſtate of Truth and Errors.

2. The cauſe he undertakes is miſerably defended againſt the Rebuke: He appears to give, *p.* 13. a Scheme of his project, *Viz.* The points left out of the Third Paper which offended the Brethren, but where's his Proof that the United Miniſters were obliged to retain ſo many Phraſes of the firſt Paper as they did? If they had uſed none but what the Church of *England* and the Aſſembly of Divines Confeſſions included, the *Heads of Union* were obſerved by them, and violated by ſuch as exacted more. Where makes he it good, that the United Miniſters rejected all the Phraſes

ſes of the Firſt Paper which they omitted; eſpecially when it was never read nor propoſed to them: Or that the omiſſion of thoſe Phraſes warrants the breach of *Union*? Such matters ought not to paſs unargued, without which none can tell *what honeſt cauſe* the *Report* pretends to, unleſs the traducing Men ſound in the Faith to cover the Turbulency of the Erroneous, ſhould be ſo Accounted. As theſe are waved, ſo he trifles in what he pretendeth to inſiſt on. Mr. *R.* demands the difference between a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Sinners, and Chriſts dying properly in the ſinners ſtead. Mr. *Lob* grants they are the ſame, and yet poureth out a Flood of impertinent words againſt the *R.* as if they widely differed. Mr. *Lob* makes Chriſts ſuffering the Puniſhment of our ſins to the ſatisfaction of Juſtice, the thing which diſtinguiſheth the Orthodox from the *Socinians*, and yet he repreſents Mr. *R.* as a *Socinian*, who oft aſſerteth, Chriſt ſuffered the Puniſhment of our ſins to the ſatisfaction of Juſtice, even Vindicative Juſtice, Mr. *R.* chargeth his Account of Change of Perſons, *Rep.* p. 5. with little leſs than Blaſphemy, he bears that with profoundeſt ſilence. Mr. *R.* blames him, that he gave not a full Report of our difference, and from its Riſe. To this he ſaith, he pretended not to give a Narrative of the whole. And yet, *Rep.* p. 4. *The difference hitherto hath been about the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.* And in his *Remarks*, oft leads his Reader to Judge we never had any other Controverſy. Indeed his Preſent State of difference was ſuch a Piece of Art, as he thought it ſo much pity to ſpoil it by a fuller Account, that their violation of the *Agreement in Doctrines*, 1692. He Anſwers only with a groan. Their refuſal of the Paper, 1694. Becauſe a diſowning of ſundry *Antinomian* Errors was added, he excuſeth no better than by an abrupt Diſmiſs, after a Suggeſtion, that

that nothing had been added but that about *Repentance*, which is not true; and yet this being in the *Assemblies* Words, he impeacheth the Refusers as insincere in subscribing this in the Assemblies Confession, and yet refusing it in that Paper. To the horrid *Passages* out of his Brethren's Books, collected to justifie a Demand of Satisfaction, and a fit Antidote when he formed their *Creeds*: with him 'tis enough *they were not sent to P. H.* as if it matter'd not that he knew they were in their Books, and before the united Ministers. What saith he to Mr *R.*'s Citations out of my Book, fully asserting Christ's Satisfaction? *ne γὲν quidem*, but caluminates still; where states he a fair Question with the *R?* Instead of that he pursues a *Logomachy*, cites Authors to prove what Mr. *R.* pleads for, and to confute what his Party reckons he defends; yea, what himself oft-times asserts. *Phrases* he tires, when the Sense is so disregarded, that I would thank him to shew one Error of Mr. *R.* (unless by gross wresting of his Words) he once remarketh; or one Doctrinal Truth he pretends to prove, which Mr. *R.* hath not expresly own'd. Upon the whole, the Cause of the *Rebuke* is still unhurt, otherwise than as its Author is pelted with his smoothest *Brothers* rotten Eggs; such as not having a *Grain of Sense*, *heretical*, *false*, *delirous*, *Changeling*, and what not? But as for the Cause of the Report, the Defendant hath wisely got that into a *Wood*, in Hopes his Party shall not find it's dead by the Rebukers Wounds.

3. I'll foretell from what I already hear and see, how several sorts are likely to judge, and stand affected to his Performance. His *Disciples* may say, All we have learned is even this. A Change of Persons and Christs suffering in our Person, if explained to a sound Sense, are no more than Christ's suffering properly in our stead: And yet Christ's suffering properly in

our

our ſtead, is not ſo much a Change of Perſons, or Suffering in our Perſon, But that we muſt call them *Socinians*, who hold Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead, if they will omit any of our Maſters other Phraſes, altho they own the Senſe of all. The Sagacious *Criſpians* (if any ſuch) will ſay he hath betrayed our Cauſe; yea, himſelf condemns it, and anon eſpouſeth it. But one good turn is done, he hath toiled hard to ſpoil what is a real Confutation of it. The *factious Biggots* may glory, whatever becomes of Truth, yet it's worth our *Contribution*, that he has ſpoiled all Hopes of that ill thing, Union and Peace too, and put the *United Miniſters* to groan we are abuſed, and as far as this *Facificator* can influence, our Breaches ſhall ſtill be wider. They whom he *remarked*, ſaying, *The Diſſenters differ about they know not what*, will loudly boaſt, *we now ſee with a witneſs*, even *the onely Man of cloſe ſtudy*, that no Man can gueſs what it is about. They who uſed to truſt to *Quotations* from Authors, muſt grow ſuſpicious, and reſolve always to examine. Hard Students (ſome ſuch there are beſides Mr. *L.*) will dread a *Common place Book of Phraſes*, leaſt they ſhould divert them from their more important Senſe, and confound themſelves to the diſtracting of the Church, and torment of all Mankind. It's well if ſome of his *reproached Preachers* ſay not, we ſtudy Things more than Words, and yet Words more than to ſpeak falſe *Engliſh*, that we may ſtrut in Bombaſtick Phraſes; and both to better purpoſe than our aſſuming Dictator, who brands us with Ignorance, and a *Zeal for Populacy*, whilſt his Gain by our more common Acceptance, qualifies him for a ſort of *cloſer Study*; but in time we may become more Politique. But which more affects me, *plain ſerious Chriſtians* with Grief will cry, we know not what to think, if the way to Heaven be thus perplexed,

and

and the Articles of our Faith ſo intricate as theſe heaps of Obſcure Phraſes repreſent them. The *Profane* are tempted to ſcoff at Religion as a wordy Noiſe, and our *Enemies* well pleaſed to ſee us deſtroy each other by dividing, and this for what expoſeth us as much to Contempt as Ruine. How much ſhould we pray for Godly ſincerity in our appeals to God, and Serviceableneſs to a common good in our pretended pleadings for Truth! And not ſtill amuſe Men, as Mr. *Lob* hath done, by a Book, the Subſtance whereof is no more than a Miſrepreſentation of the R's words, that the Reader may believe him an Heretick in grain, when the plain ſenſe of his Expreſſion ſeems oft contended for by Mr. *Lob*. Nor can people propoſe a benefit by multiplied Quotations of a Phraſe, when the Authors, who uſe it, deſign by that Phraſe no more than Mr. *I.* grants. And his Exception is not againſt their ſenſe of that Phraſe, but againſt impoſing it as a Term of Union, after the *Criſpians* and Mr. *Lob* had ſo perverted it.

FINIS.